101st Congress 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | Report 101-889

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1991, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

October 16, 1990.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Bevill, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5019]

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5019) "making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 34, 48, 60, 61 and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 25, 26, 38, 41, 42, 43, 55, 56, 63, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Daingerfield, Texas, $1,900,000;

Miami River Sediments, Florida, $200,000;

Monroe County Beach Erosion (Smathers Beach), Florida, $193,000;

Wyoming Valley Levee Raising, Pennsylvania, $1,000,000:

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

H183-18

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert *$2,000,000;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,450,669,000;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, using $900,000 of the funds appropriated herein, is directed to undertake a major rehabilitation of the Johnstown, Pennsylvania, project to insure that the project will continue to provide the authorized level of protection in the future. The Secretary is further directed to investigate those non-federally owned buildings, embankments and walls which were included in the line of protection for the convenience of the Government and to perform needed repair, rehabilitation or replacement at Federal expense subject to the following terms: (1) The City of Johnstown secures needed rights of access to such structures; (2) the City of Johnstown agrees to hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction or operation and maintenance of the work on the non-Federal structures, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake improvements to roads, utilities, and other facilities at the Crowder Point East Recreation Area at Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma, using funds appropriated for that purpose in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1989, Public Law 100–371*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$642,897,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$170,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 37, 39, 40, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 62, 64, 65, 66, 70 and 71.

TOM BEVILL,
LINDY (Mrs. HALE) BOGGS,
VIC FAZIO,
WES WATKINS,
LINDSAY THOMAS,
JIM CHAPMAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
CARL D. PURSELL,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
(except amendment No. 51),
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
JIM SASSER,
DENNIS DECONCINI,
HARRY REID,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
JAMES A. MCCLURE,
JAKE GARN,
THAD COCHRAN,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
ARLEN SPECTER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5019) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$146,435,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $146,435,000 for General Investigations instead of $167,847,000 as proposed by the House and $153,335,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree with the language contained in the Senate Report regarding the Devils Lake, North Dakota, project.

The conferees direct the attention of the Corps of Engineers to the House and Senate Reports in allocating Section 22 Planning Assistance to the States funds. It is the intention of the conferees not to earmark funds for this program in the future.

The conference agreement includes $2,000,000 for the Magnetic Levitation Transportation Pilot Program, $3,500,000 for the Construction Productivity Advancement Research program and deletes funding for the Climate Change Impact Program.

Amendment No. 2: Earmarks $220,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Casino Beach, Chicago, Illinois, project as proposed by the House. The Senate bill deleted funding for this project.

Amendment No. 3: Earmarks $2,000,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs (CUP), Illinois, project as proposed by the House instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Earmarks $125,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, project as proposed by the House. The Senate bill deleted funding for this project.

Amendment No. 5: Earmarks $220,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, project as proposed by the House instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Earmarks $600,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, project as proposed by the House instead of $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Earmarks $1,900,000 for the Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Daingerfield, Texas, project; $200,000 for the Miami River Sediments, Florida, project; $193,000 for the Monroe County Beach Erosion (Smathers Beach), Florida, project; and $1,000,000 for the Wyoming Valley Levee Raising, Pennsylvania, project as proposed by the House. The Senate bill deleted funding for these projects. The conference agreement also deletes funding included in the House bill for the Taylorsville Lake (Routt Road Bridge), Kentucky, project as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that adds language that provides that the Secretary of the Army is to work in partnership with Department of Energy in conducting research and development associated with an advanced high speed magnetic levitation transportation system.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the funds appropriated to the Corps of Engineers in Public Law 101-101 for Magnetic Levitation Research and Development activities are hereby authorized for expenditure only in accordance with the directions contained in Senate Report 101-83 and House Report 101-235: Provided further, That with $200,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to resume preconstruction engineering and design of the St. Louis Harbor, Missouri and Illinois, project*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate that provides that funds appropriated in Public Law 101-101 for magnetic levitation research and development shall be expended only in accordance with the directions contained in Senate Report 101-83 and House Report 101-235, amended to include language directing the Secretary of the Army to utilize $200,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act to resume preconstruction engineering and design of the St. Louis Harbor, Missouri and Illinois, project.

Amendment No. 10: Restores House language deleted by the Senate amended to provide that $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act shall be used to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors project upon release of the Corps of Engineers South Pacific Division Engineer's notice of completion of the feasibility report instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided further, That with $800,000 of the funds provided herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to accelerate preconstruction engineering and design for the Folly Beach, South Carolina, project and complete the General Design Memorandum by May 1991 so that project construction could begin in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1992: Provided. further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use $300,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate and expedite a reconnaissance study to develop a recommended plan for flood damage prevention and other water resources problems along the Ohio River and its tributaries in Belmont and Jefferson Counties, Ohio: Provided further, That using $270,000 of funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate and complete engineering and design of the Bethel, Alaska, bank stabilization project*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate providing for the use of $800,000 to accelerate proconstruction engineering and design of the Folly Beach, South Carolina, project amended to correct a date; includes language proposed by the Senate directing the use of $300,000 for a reconnaissance study of flooding and other water resources problems along the Ohio River and its tributaries in Belmont and Jefferson Counties, Ohio; and includes language proposed by the Senate directing the use of $270,000 for engineering and design of the Bethel, Alaska, bank stabilization project amended to clarify that the funds are to be used to initiate and complete engineering and design.

Amendment No. 12: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $60,000 for the Village Creek, Taylor Bay, Arkansas, project. This language is not required since funding for this project is included in the amount appropriated in Amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 13: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $450,000 for the Jackson Hole, Wyoming, project. This language is not required since funding for this project is included in the amount appropriated in Amendment No. 1.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$1,050,450,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $1,050,450,000 for Construction, General excluding the Red River Waterway project instead of $1,300,389,000 as proposed by the House and $1,215,407,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have provided $1,000,000 for the Sacramento Flood Control Project to be used by the Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, to plan, design and construct historical wetlands in the Yolo Basin, California, under the authority of section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 as outlined in House Report 101-536, Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, Wetlands Research Program.

The conference agreement includes funding for the projects in the Continuing Authorities Programs listed in the House and Senate Reports. The conference agreement also includes $125,000 for a section 205 flood control study in Pinal County, Arizona, between the Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$4,100,000, which is to be utilized to construct emergency bank stabilization measures including repairs to revetments and realignments upstream of Shreveport, Louisiana, to Index, Arkansas, that were significantly damaged in the May 1990 flood in the Red River Basin*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees are aware of the damages sustained to the revetments and realignment works in the May 1990 flood in the Red River Basin and the need to provide additional bank stabilization to areas not previously protected. Damage to these revetments and realignment works is known to be significant, and early repairs are essential. The Corps of Engineers is directed to survey damages and set priorities on items needing repair. Although the normal maintenance of revetments and realignments above Shreveport, Louisiana, is a local sponsor responsibility, the flood damages incurred are considerably beyond the scope of normal maintenance. Therefore the conferees have provided $4,100,000 for the Red River Emergency Bank Protection project to accomplish needed repairs and to construct new bank stabilization measures.

Amendment No. 16: Earmarks $6,000,000 for the Kissimmee River, Florida, project as proposed by the House instead if $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Earmarks $9,200,000 for the Wallisville Lake, Texas, project and $5,000,000 for the Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, project as proposed by the House. The Senate bill deleted funding for these projects.

Amendment No. 18: Earmarks $1,500,000 for the Platte River Flood and Steambank Erosion Control Demonstration Project, Nebraska, and $975,000 for the San Diego River and Mission Bay, California, project as proposed by the House. The Senate bill deleted funding for these projects.

Amendment No. 19: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to utilize $6,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act to initiate construction of the lower Mingo County, West Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project.

The conference agreement includes $11,299,000 for the South Williamson element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project, the same as the budget request. In carrying out the South Williamson element, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to include the work described in Feature Design Memorandum No. 18, South Williamson Pump Station, dated July 1988.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that provides that no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to construction of the lower Mingo County, West Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Bid Sandy River and Upper Cumberland project.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that provides that the Matewan, West Virginia, flood protection project shall include all incorporated units within the town of Matewan.

Amendment No. 22: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to award continuing contracts until construction is complete under the terms and conditions of Public Law 101-101 for the Wallisville Lake, Texas, project.

Amendment No. 23: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to construct the Salyersville, Kentucky, project using $400,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes House language striken by the Senate that authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to undertake construction of the Lower and Middle Rouge Rivers projects in Michigan using $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act.

Amendment No. 25: Earmarks $975,000 for the Tulsa and West Tulsa Local Protection Project, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26: Deletes House language stricken by the Senate that specifically authorizes the Secretary of the Army to repair and restore to a safe condition the Tulsa and West Tulsa Local Protection Project in Oklahoma. This language is not required since the conferees have been advised that the project is authorized.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to study, design, and construct streambank protection measures at McGregor Park in Clarksville, Tennessee, using $550,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to relocate the Southeast Light on Block Island, Rhode Island, subject to enactment of authorizing legislation, using $970,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that deletes House language appropriating $61,636,000 for construction of the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project and adds language that appropriates $92,636,000 for the Red River Waterway project and provides direction to the Secretary of the Army regarding the use of those funds.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to design and construct a support structure for the Seafarers Memorial in the Columbia River using $150,000 of the funds appropriated in the act.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$344,606,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $344,606,000 for Flood Control, Mississippi River and tributaries instead of $342,731,000 as proposed by the House and $338,993,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree with the action taken by the Senate to rename the Yazoo Basin Reformulation Unit as a restudy and direct that the restudy be limited to an examination of alternatives that fall within the scope of the currently authorized Yazoo Basin projects.

The conferees agree with the language contained in the Senate report that clarifies the terms under which the Corps of Engineers is to complete the water balance study for the northwest Mississippi region.

The conferees agree with the language in the House report regarding the Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Demonstration Erosion Control Program.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to utilize $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the act to construct the West Memphis, Arkansas, project; directs the Secretary of the Army to utilize $400,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act for the Ouachita River Levees project in Louisiana; and provides that the Bayou Rapides Drainage Structure and Pumping Plant is to be included in the Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $1,450,669,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General instead of $1,457,488,000 as proposed by the House and $1,408,791,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree with the House with regard to the need for the comprehensive study of the Alabama-Coosa and Appalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basins. The conferees note that interim reallocations of storage for water supply may be necessary while the study is being conducted.

The conferees have no objection to the Corps of Engineers proceeding with the review and study of the operation and maintenance program as described in the October 5, 1990, letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to the House and Senate committees.

Amendment No. 34: Earmarks $3,630,000 for the Long-Term Management Strategy for dredged material disposal in the San Francisco Bay, California, region as proposed by the House instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided further, That $2,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to continue the development of recreation facilities at Sepulveda Dam, California: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use $3,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein for the Federal share of construction of access facilities in the McAlpine Lock and Dam navigation pool. The non-Federal interests shall be credited for previous work related to access, including $3,000,000 for 1,060 feet of the new downtown wharf. Non-*

Federal interests shall provide necessary easements to the Federal Government for construction of improvements at no cost to the Federal Government. Title for lands shall remain with non-Federal interests: Provided further, That $100,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to continue the Sauk Lake, Minnesota, project: Provided further, That with $350,000 of the funds herein appropriated to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use continuing contracts to design and construct a riverfront park at Charleston, West Virginia, in accordance with the cost sharing principles of Public Law 99-662 and as generally described in the September 1989 Reconnaissance Report of the Huntington District entitled, Charleston Riverfront Park, Winfield Navigation Pool, Kanawha River: Provided further, That no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to construction of Charleston Riverfront Park, West Virginia

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement restores House language stricken by the Senate earmarking funds for development of recreation facilities at Sepulveda Dam, California; restores House language stricken by the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to use $3,500,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act for construction of access facilities in the McAlpine Lock and Dam navigation pool; restores House language stricken by the Senate that earmarks funds for the Sauk Lake, Minnesota, project; and includes language proposed by the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to use $350,000 appropriated in the Act to design and construct a riverfront park at Charleston, West Virginia, and provides that no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to construction of the Charleston Riverfront Park.

Amendment No. 36: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to undertake a major rehabilitation of the Johnstown, Pennsylvania, project; restores House language stricken by the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to undertake improvements to facilities at the Crowder Point East Recreation Area at Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma, using previously appropriated funds; and deletes House language stricken by the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to maintain and improve Bugtussle Road at Lake Eufaula, Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that provides that $7,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act are to be used for a replacement for the existing Corps of Engineers bridge at St. Georges, Delaware.

REVOLVING FUND

Both the House and Senate committees have previously expressed concern about the costs and justification of the Corps of Engineers Automation Plan (CEAP). As a result, in the Statement of Managers accompanying the FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, the conferees directed that no further acquisitions for CEAP could be made beyond those required for the pilot test. In a letter dated September 17, 1990, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) advised the House and Senate committees of the results of the pilot test. Based on those results, which demonstrated that the benefits of the program exceeded costs and resulted in a revised program with significantly reduced costs, the conferees have no objection to the Corps of Engineers proceeding with further acquisitions for CEAP as outlined in the above referenced letter.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $20,000,000 for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

General Expenses

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to complete the conceptual study of field organization structures in accordance with Senate Report 101-83 and the Conference Report accompanying Public Law 101-101 (House Report 101-235).

General Provisions

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Amendment No. 40: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that deletes House language amending Section 4(t)(3)(F) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 and replaces it with Senate language amending the same provision of law. Section 4(t)(3)(F) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 provided up to $600,000 in debt relief to the city of Aberdeen, Washington, because the transfer of operation and maintenance responsibility for the Wynoochee Lake project from the Corps of Engineers to the city had been delayed. Language in the House bill extended the period of debt relief until the date of transfer of responsibility to the city. The Senate provision agreed to by the conferees extends the period of debt relief to June 30, 1990, and removes the $600,000 limitation.

Amendment No. 41: Deletes House language stricken by the Senate directing the Secretary of the Army to construct loading facilities at Boudinot Harbor on the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System.

Amendment No. 42: Changes a section number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Changes a section number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that directs the Secretary of the Army to conclude a Local Cooperation Agreement for facilities across the Missouri River in the vicinity of Ft. Yates, North Dakota, and provides $250,000 for planning, engineering and design of the project.

Amendment No. 45: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that modifies the authorization for the San Luis Rey, California, project.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
[N]	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	---	347,000	---	347,000
[N]	CHICKASAW CREEK, AL	30,000	---	30,000	---
	CHOCTAWHATCHEE & PEA RIVER BASIN, AL & FL	---	---	400,000	---
[FDP]	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AL	64,000	---	64,000	---
	ALASKA				
[SP]	BETHEL, AK	---	---	---	270,000
[N]	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	---	233,000	---	233,000
[FDP]	RIVERS AND HARBORS, AK	396,000	---	396,000	---
[FDP]	SEWARD, AK	125,000	---	125,000	---
[FDP]	UNALASKA, AK	136,000	---	136,000	---
	ARIZONA				
[FDP]	CENTRAL MARICOPA COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY, AZ	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	HASSAYAMPA RIVER NEAR WICKENBURG, AZ	---	---	300,000	---
	HOLBROOK, AZ	---	---	---	900,000
[FC]	NOGALES WASH, AZ	---	300,000	---	300,000
[FC]	RILLITO, AZ	---	610,000	---	610,000
[FDP]	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	250,000	---	250,000	---
	ARKANSAS				
[FDP]	CENTRAL ARKANSAS STUDY, AR	500,000	---	500,000	---
[FDP]	LITTLE RIVER COUNTY, AR	---	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, HOT SPRINGS, GARLAND COUNTY, AR	275,000	---	275,000	---
	RED RIVER WW, SHREVEPORT, LA TO VICINITY OF INDEX, AR	---	---	---	50,000
	RED RIVER WW, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX	---	---	---	300,000
[RCP]	VILLAGE CREEK TAYLOR BAY, AR [SECTION 216]	---	---	60,000	---
	AMERICAN SAMOA				
[COM]	TERRITORIES DEVELOPMENT STUDY, AS	250,000	---	250,000	---
	CALIFORNIA				
[FC]	AMERICAN AND SACRAMENTO RIVERS, CA	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
	ARROYO PASAJERO [FRESNO COUNTY], CA	---	---	250,000	---

	CACHE CREEK BASIN [LAKE COUNTY], CA	---	---	500,000	---
	CALIENTE CREEK, CA	---	---	250,000	---
	CALLEGUAS CREEK, CA	---	---	400,000	---
[SPE]	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTH COAST REGION	---	---	400,000	---
[FC]	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	424,000	---	424,000
[FC]	DRY CREEK, ROSEVILLE, CA	---	300,000	---	300,000
[N]	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY [DEEPENING], CA	225,000	---	225,000	---
[FC]	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
[N]	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	250,000	---	250,000	2,000,000
[FC]	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	---	550,000	---	550,000
	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	150,000	---
[N]	MONTEREY HARBOR, CA	210,000	---	210,000	---
[N]	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	---	270,000	---	270,000
[FC]	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	410,000	---	410,000
	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMER RVR WATERSHED, CA...	---	---	275,000	---
	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO METRO AREA, CA	---	---	90,000	---
[FDP]	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YOLO BYPASS, CA	400,000	---	400,000	---
[FDP]	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	375,000	---	375,000	---
[N]	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	---	175,000	---	257,000
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	---	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	350,000	---	350,000	---
[SP]	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA	336,000	---	336,000	---
[N]	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	---	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALAVERAS RIVER, CA	325,000	---	325,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA	70,000	---	70,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, MOKELUMNE RIVER & TRIBS, CA..	300,000	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SAN JOAQUIN R MAIN STEM & TRI	---	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	64,000	---	154,000	---
[FDP]	SAN LORENZO, CA	98,000	---	98,000	---
[FC]	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	---	100,000	---	100,000
[N]	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FDP]	SANTA ANA RIVER & ORANGE CO, CA	270,000	---	270,000	---
[SP]	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY [BEACH EROSION], CA	122,000	---	122,000	---
[N]	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	---	150,000	---	150,000
	SANTA BARBARA & VENTURA COUNTIES, EMERG WATER SUPPLIES	---	---	300,000	---
	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR SHOALING, CA	---	---	200,000	---
[N]	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA	142,000	---	142,000	---
[FDP]	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
[N]	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	---	210,000	---	300,000
[FDP]	WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA	85,000	---	150,000	---
	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	340,000	---
	COLORADO				
[FC]	ALAMOSA, CO	---	240,000	---	240,000
[FDP]	BOXELDER, SPRING, & DRY CREEKS, FT. COLLINS, CO	70,000	---	70,000	---
[FDP]	GOOSE CREEK, BOULDER, CO	70,000	---	70,000	---
[FDP]	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO	100,000	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	CONNECTICUT				
[COM]	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT.........	90,000	---	90,000	---
	DELAWARE				
[N]	C&D CANAL-BALTIMORE HARBOR CONNECTING CHNLS [DEEP.], D	550,000	---	550,000	---
[SP]	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ.......................	355,000	---	355,000	---
[SP]	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	393,000	---	393,000	---
[N]	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL..................................	---	400,000	---	400,000
[N]	CANAVERAL HARBOR, SAND BYPASS, FL.....................	---	415,000	---	415,000
[FDP]	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY, FL..	750,000	---	750,000	---
[FDP]	FROG POND, FL...	98,000	---	98,000	---
[FDP]	HILLSBORO CANAL, FL...................................	150,000	---	150,000	---
[FDP]	LOWER HILLSBOROUGH RIVER AND CURIOSITY CREEK, FL......	80,000	---	80,000	---
[N]	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL..............................	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
	MIAMI RIVER SEDIMENTS, FL.............................	---	---	---	200,000
	MONROE COUNTY BEACH EROSION, FL [SMATHERS BEACH]......	---	---	---	193,000
[N]	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL................................	200,000	---	200,000	---
[BE]	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL...............................	---	800,000	---	800,000
[N]	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL................................	---	200,000	---	200,000
	PERDIDO KEY BEACHES, FL...............................	---	---	30,000	---
	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL............................	---	---	---	250,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL FLORIDA SIMULATION MODEL, FL............	---	---	207,000	---
	ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL [WATER QUALITY MGMT]..............	---	---	150,000	---
	ST. PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL.............................	---	---	65,000	---
	TAMPA BAY [COASTAL AREAS], FL.........................	---	---	250,000	---
[N]	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER AND BIG BEND, FL...........	100,000	---	100,000	---
	GEORGIA				
[N]	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA..................................	---	50,000	---	50,000
[SP]	GLYNN COUNTY BEACHES, GA..............................	400,000	---	400,000	---
	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA..............................	---	---	150,000	---
[MP]	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, WILDLIFE MITIGATION, GA	---	300,000	---	300,000
[N]	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE, GA.....................	---	50,000	---	50,000
[N]	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA.........................	150,000	---	150,000	---
[FDP]	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC.....................	123,000	---	123,000	---
	SOUTH ATLANTIC CONTAINERIZED CARGO TRAFFIC STUDY, GA..	---	---	1,100,000	---

HAWAII

[N]	HILO HARBOR, HI	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FDP]	URBAN FLOOD CONTROL - HONOLULU, HI	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WAIKIKI BEACH, HI	---	---	100,000	---

IDAHO

[FDP]	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR & WA	61,000	---	61,000	---
[FC]	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, VICINITY OF GOODING AND SHOSHONE, I	---	300,000	---	300,000
[FDP]	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY	211,000	---	211,000	---
[FDP]	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	150,000	---	150,000	---
	APPLE CREEK RESERVOIR, IL	---	---	400,000	---
	CASINO BEACH, CHICAGO, IL	---	---	---	220,000
[FDP]	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	200,000	---	200,000	---
[BE]	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL	---	100,000	---	100,000
[RCP]	ILLINOIS WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
[FC]	MCCOOK & THORNTON RESERVOIRS [CUP], IL	---	---	---	2,000,000
[N]	OLMSTEAD LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY	---	3,532,000	---	---
[RCP]	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, IL, IA, MN,	514,000	---	514,000	---

INDIANA

[FC]	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	---	585,000	---	585,000
[BE]	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	105,000	---	105,000
	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	---	---	50,000	---
[N]	JEFFERSONVILLE, IN	127,000	---	127,000	---
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN	---	---	---	125,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN [CADY MARSH DITCH], IN	---	---	---	220,000
[FDP]	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPRE. STUDY, IN & IL[MID WABASH R	100,000	---	100,000	---

IOWA

[FDP]	BLACK HAWK COUNTY, IA	89,000	---	89,000	---
[N]	MISSOURI RIVER F&WL MITIGATION, IA, NE, KS & MO	---	429,000	---	429,000
[FC]	PERRY CREEK, IA	---	100,000	---	485,000
[FDP]	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, IA	97,000	---	97,000	---
[FC]	WEST DES MOINES-DES MOINES, IA	---	354,000	---	354,000

KANSAS

[FC]	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	---	300,000	---	300,000
[FDP]	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULS	582,000	---	582,000	---
[FDP]	CANEY RIVER, KS & OK	210,000	---	210,000	---
[RCP]	SOLDIER CREEK DIVERSION UNIT, TOPEKA, KS	120,000	---	120,000	---
[FDP]	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	UPPER LITTLE ARKANSAS RIVER WATERSHED, KS	---	210,000	---	210,000
[FC]	WINFIELD, KS	---	150,000	---	150,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	KENTUCKY				
	BEAVER CREEK, FLOYD COUNTY, KY........................	---	---	---	200,000
[N]	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN &.	1,008,000	---	1,008,000	---
[FDP]	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY..................................	171,000	---	171,000	---
[N]	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY............................	---	---	100,000	---
[FDP]	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (EAGLE CREEK INTERIM)..	---	---	500,000	---
[FC]	HAZARD, KY..	---	200,000	---	200,000
[FDP]	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, KY (JACKSON INTERIM)..	220,000	---	220,000	---
[FDP]	LICKING RIVER, KY....................................	100,000	---	200,000	---
[N]	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY......................	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
[FDP]	METRO LOUISVILLE, KY.................................	300,000	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.........	1,065,000	---	1,065,000	---
[N]	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL & IN (UNIONTOWN LOCKS & D	250,000	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	SALT RIVER BASIN, KY.................................	225,000	---	225,000	---
[FC]	SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY..................................	---	152,000	---	152,000
	LOUISIANA				
[N]	ALGIERS LOCK, LA.....................................	---	---	625,000	---
[FC]	ALOHA RIGOLETTE, LA..................................	---	400,000	---	400,000
[FDP]	AMITE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LA........................	400,000	---	400,000	---
[N]	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY, LA.....	22,000	---	22,000	---
[FC]	COMITE RIVER, LA.....................................	---	700,000	---	700,000
[N]	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION...........	---	---	---	200,000
[FDP]	LA COASTAL AREA, LOUISIANA COMPRE. COASTAL WETLANDS, L	563,000	---	1,030,000	---
[FDP]	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA......	78,000	---	78,000	---
[FDP]	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LAND LOSS & MARSH CREATION, LA	171,000	---	171,000	---
[N]	MERMENTAU RIVER, GIWW TO THE GULF, LA.................	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FDP]	MERMENTAU, VERMILION AND CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECH	460,000	---	660,000	---
	ORLEANS & JEFFERSON PARISHES (COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD CONTROL & WATER QUALITY), LA.........................	---	---	800,000	---
[COM]	RED RIVER BASIN, AR & LA, COMPREHENSIVE STUDY..........	425,000	---	425,000	---
[FC]	TANGIPAHOA, TCHEFUNCTE, AND TICKFAW RIVERS, LA........	---	50,000	---	50,000
[FC]	UPPER BAYOU TECHE, LA................................	---	400,000	---	400,000
[FC]	WEST BANK HURRICANE PROTECTION, EAST OF HARVEY CANAL..	---	---	---	600,000
	WEST BANK HURRICANE PROTECTION, LAKE CATAOUACHE LEVEE.	---	---	500,000	---
	MARYLAND				
[N]	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS.........................	---	---	150,000	---
[FDP]	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC................	200,000	---	200,000	---

[RCP]	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE REALLOCATION, MD & WV	150,000	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	MONONGAHELA RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV	50,000	---	50,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
[N]	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	---	500,000	---	500,000
	CONNECTICUT RIVER, MA	---	---	150,000	---
	HYANNIS HARBOR, MA	---	---	200,000	---
[FC]	SAUGUS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MA	---	2,400,000	---	2,400,000
[FDP]	SPICKET RIVER, MA & NH	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MICHIGAN				
	CLINTON RIVER SPILLWAY, MI	---	---	225,000	---
[FC]	ECORSE CREEK, MI	---	205,000	---	205,000
[N]	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHNLS & HBRS FINAL REPORT, MN,M	---	360,000	---	360,000
[RDP]	MENOMINEE RIVER, MI & WI	103,000	---	103,000	---
[N]	SAGINAW BAY AND SAGINAW RIVER, MI	---	---	150,000	---
[N]	MONROE HARBOR, MI	---	100,000	---	100,000
[N]	ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	180,000	---	180,000	---
	MINNESOTA				
[FDP]	CROOKSTON, MN	290,000	---	290,000	---
[FC]	HOUSTON, MN	---	284,000	---	284,000
	LITTLE FALLS, MN	---	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	RED LAKE & CLEARWATER RIVERS , MN	152,000	---	152,000	---
	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN	---	---	250,000	---
[FC]	ST. PAUL, MN	---	397,000	---	397,000
[RDP]	WAHPETON, ND - BRECKENRIDGE, MN	60,000	---	60,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI				
[FDP]	CANEY CREEK, JACKSON, MS	100,000	---	100,000	---
[N]	ESCATAWPA RIVER, JACKSON COUNTY, MS	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FDP]	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS	250,000	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS	130,000	---	130,000	---
	MISSOURI				
[FDP]	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	63,000	---	63,000	---
[FC]	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	10,000	---	10,000
[FC]	COLDWATER CREEK, MO	---	600,000	---	600,000
[FDP]	CUIVRE RIVER AREA AND VICINITY, MO	135,000	---	135,000	---
[FDP]	DARDENNE CREEK, MO	170,000	---	170,000	---
[RDP]	DRY FORK AND EAST FORK LAKES, FISHING RIVER, MO	103,000	---	103,000	---
	JEFFERSON COUNTY, MO	---	---	300,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
[FDP]	PLATTIN CREEK, MO	155,000	---	155,000	---
[FC]	RIVER DES PERES, MO	---	718,000	---	718,000
[FDP]	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY	140,000	---	140,000	---
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO	---	---	100,000	---
	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	---	---	200,000
	STE. GENEVIEVE, MO	---	---	---	600,000
[FDP]	WYACONDA RIVER BASIN, MO AND IA	---	---	150,000	---
	NEBRASKA				
[FDP]	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	21,000	---	21,000	---
[FDP]	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	28,000	---	28,000	---
[FC]	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	---	150,000	---	150,000
	NEVADA				
[FDP]	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBS (DUCK CREEK), NV	200,000	---	200,000	---
	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	---	---	700,000	---
[FDP]	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV	257,000	---	500,000	---
[FC]	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	---	500,000	---	500,000
[FC]	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	1,476,000	---	1,476,000
	WASHOE VALLEY, ELKO, NV	---	---	150,000	---
	NEW JERSEY				
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	290,000	---	290,000	---
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ PA & DE	---	---	---	1,000,000
[N]	DE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ, TIOGA MARIN	---	100,000	---	100,000
[FC]	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	---	590,000	---	590,000
[SP]	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION	---	---	700,000	---
[FC]	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	---	420,000	---	420,000
[FC]	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ	---	5,000,000	---	5,800,000
[FC]	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	---	250,000	---	250,000
[FC]	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
[N]	SALEM RIVER, NJ	---	150,000	---	150,000
	NEW MEXICO				
[FDP]	ESPANOLA VALLEY, NM	---	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	ALBUQUERQUE ARROYOS, NM	140,000	---	140,000	---

[FDP]	LAS CRUCES, NM, EL PASO AND VICINITY	130,000	---	130,000	---
[FC]	ROSWELL, PECOS RIVER, NM	---	460,000	---	460,000
[FC]	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	---	263,000	---	263,000
	NEW YORK				
[BE]	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INL TO NORTON PT., NY.	---	250,000	---	250,000
[N]	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---
[SPEC]	MONTANK POINT, NY	---	---	200,000	---
[SP]	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	150,000	---	150,000	---
	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	---	---	250,000	---
[N]	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	---	364,000	---	364,000
[N]	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	---	---	100,000	---
[FC]	WESTCHESTER CTY STREAMS, SHELDRAKE R TOWN OF MAMARONEC	---	150,000	---	150,000
	NORTH CAROLINA				
	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LOCKWOODS FOLLY INLET.	---	---	200,000	---
[N]	CAPE FEAR-NORTHEAST [CAPE FEAR] RIVER, NC	160,000	---	160,000	---
	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT, NC	115,000	---	365,000	---
[N]	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	---	460,000	---	460,000
[FC]	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, NC & SC	---	800,000	---	800,000
[BE]	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET, NC	---	460,000	---	460,000
[N]	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC	---	206,000	---	206,000
[SP]	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH - NORTH PORTION, NC	132,000	---	132,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA				
[FDP]	GRAND FORKS, ND	177,000	---	177,000	---
	DEVILS LAKE, ND	---	---	600,000	---
	OHIO				
[FC]	FAIRFIELD, OH	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FC]	HOLES CREEK AT WEST CARROLLTON AND MORAINE, OH	---	100,000	---	100,000
[FDP]	OHIO RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY	---	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, OH, KY & IN	200,000	---	200,000	---
	OTTAWA RIVER, OH	---	---	300,000	---
[SPE]	TRUMBULL COUNTY, OH	40,000	---	40,000	---
[FC]	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000
	OKLAHOMA				
[FDP]	CRUTCHO CREEK, OK	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	---	168,000	---	168,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	KAW DAM TO KEYSTONE LAKE BANK STABILIZATION, OK.......	---	---	350,000	---
[FDP]	MIAMI, OK & VICINITY..................................	105,000	---	105,000	---
	OREGON				
[N]	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING STUDY, OR & WA.......	100,000	---	1,200,000	---
[MP]	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA...	---	450,000	---	450,000
[FDP]	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR...................................	---	---	250,000	---
[N]	COOS BAY, OR [DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION]..................	35,000	---	35,000	---
[FDP]	JOHNSON CREEK, OR.....................................	140,000	---	140,000	---
[FDP]	WALLA WALLA RIVER, OR & WA............................	---	---	210,000	---
	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL..................	---	---	400,000	---
[FDP]	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW STUDY, OR...............	314,000	---	314,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA				
[FDP]	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA.................................	77,000	---	77,000	---
[FDP]	JUNIATA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, PA.......................	60,000	---	60,000	---
[FDP]	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA..................................	45,000	---	45,000	---
[FC]	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA..................................	---	300,000	---	300,000
[N]	LOCK AND DAM 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA...........	---	900,000	---	900,000
[FDP]	POTTSTOWN [SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN], PA................	---	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA.....................................	165,000	---	165,000	---
[FDP]	READING [SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN], PA..................	---	---	100,000	---
[FC]	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA..........................	---	310,000	---	310,000
	SAW MILL RUN BASIN, PA................................	---	---	200,000	---
	SOUTH BRANCH BLACKLICK CREEK, PA......................	---	---	100,000	---
[FDP]	WYOMING VALLEY, PA - INFLATABLE DAM...................	150,000	---	150,000	---
	WYOMING VALLEY LEVEE RAISING, PA......................	---	---	---	1,000,000
	PUERTO RICO				
[N]	GUAYANES, LAS MAREAS AND GUAYANILLA HARBORS, PR.......	77,000	---	77,000	---
[FC]	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR...................................	---	900,000	---	900,000
[FDP]	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR..............................	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR..................................	---	675,000	---	675,000
[N]	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR...................................	---	900,000	---	900,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
[BE]	FOLLY BEACH, SC.......................................	---	400,000	---	800,000
[BE]	MYRTLE BEACH, SC......................................	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
[SP]	SOUTH CAROLINA SHORES, SC.............................	300,000	---	300,000	---

	SOUTH DAKOTA				
[FDP]	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	94,000	---	94,000	---
[FDP]	JAMES RIVER BASIN, SD	186,000	---	186,000	---
[FDP]	VERMILLION RIVER BASIN, SD	---	---	100,000	---
[FDP]	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	98,000	---	98,000	---
[FC]	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	---	50,000	---	50,000
	TENNESSEE				
[FDP]	METROPOLITAN CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON CO., TN	---	---	500,000	---
[FC]	MILL CREEK, TN	---	400,000	---	400,000
	TEXAS				
[FDP]	ABILENE, TX [BRAZOS RIVER BASIN]	42,000	---	42,000	---
[FC]	ABILENE, TX [BRAZOS RIVER BASIN]	---	258,000	---	258,000
[FC]	BEAL'S CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	---	145,000	---	145,000
[FDP]	BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TX	---	---	150,000	---
[FC]	BRAYS BAYOU [HOUSTON], TX	---	900,000	---	900,000
[N]	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX [42-FOOT PROJECT]	---	215,000	---	215,000
[N]	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	---	184,000	---	184,000
	CYPRESS CREEK, TX	---	---	---	750,000
[MP]	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	---	---	---	350,000
[FC]	FALFURRIAS, TX	---	200,000	---	200,000
[FC]	FIVE MILE CREEK, DALLAS, TX	---	135,000	---	135,000
[RCP]	GIWW-ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	500,000	---	500,000	---
[RCP]	GIWW-SARGENT BEACH, TX	500,000	---	690,000	160,000
[FC]	GREENS BAYOU [HOUSTON], TX	---	723,000	---	723,000
[N]	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
[FC]	LOWER RIO GRANDE, ARROYO COLORADO, TX	---	300,000	---	300,000
[FC]	LOWER RIO GRANDE, SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	75,000	---	75,000
[SP]	MATAGORDA COUNTY SHORE, TX	80,000	---	80,000	---
[N]	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	276,000	---	276,000	---
[FC]	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	---	300,000	---	643,000
[N]	PORT LAVACA TO RED BLUFF, TX	77,000	---	77,000	---
	RED RIVER WW., SHREVEPORT, LA TO DAINGERFIELD, TX	---	---	---	1,900,000
[FDP]	SAN BERNARD RIVER WATERSHED, TX	150,000	---	150,000	---
[COMP]	TRINITY RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE	---	---	900,000	---
[FC]	SHOAL CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	---	800,000	---	800,000
[FDP]	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	650,000	---	650,000	---
	UTAH				
[FC]	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	---	400,000	---	400,000
[FDP]	WEBER RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT	300,000	---	300,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	VIRGINIA				
[RCP]	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	223,000	---	223,000	---
[FC]	BUENA VISTA [LP], VA	---	600,000	---	1,695,000
[N]	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	262,000	---	262,000	---
[FDP]	UPPER JAMES RIVER BASIN, VA & WV	131,000	---	131,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
[FC]	CENTRALIA, WA	---	464,000	---	464,000
[FC]	CHEHALIS RIVER, WA [SOUTH ABERDEEN, COSMOPOLIS]	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM MODIFICATION, WA	---	---	150,000	---
[COMP]	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA. [WATER SUPPLY]	---	---	250,000	---
[RCP]	HOWARD HANSON DAM, ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE, WA	42,000	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	LOWER SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	100,000	---	100,000	---
[N]	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	76,000	---	76,000	---
[FDP]	TRI-CITIES LEVEES, WA	225,000	---	225,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
[FC]	CABIN CREEK LPP, WV	---	500,000	---	500,000
[FC]	ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WV	---	400,000	---	400,000
[N]	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	650,000	---	650,000	---
[FDP]	LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER BASIN, WV	180,000	---	180,000	---
[FC]	MOOREFIELD, WV	---	400,000	---	1,000,000
[FC]	PETERSBURG, WV	---	600,000	---	1,000,000
[SPE]	WEST VIRGINIA COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, WV [OHIO RIV MI 40-	---	---	500,000	---
	WISCONSIN				
[RCP]	FOX RIVER, WI	310,000	---	310,000	---
[N]	FOX RIVER CHANNEL GREEN BAY, WI	---	225,000	---	225,000
[FDP]	MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN AREA, WI	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FC]	PORTAGE, WI	---	414,000	---	414,000
	WYOMING				
	JACKSON HOLE, WY	---	---	450,000	---

REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS				
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	10,250,000	---	9,250,000	---
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA				
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEMS	300,000	---	300,000	---
FEDERAL STRATEGY FOR AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE	350,000	---	1,000,000	---
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	9,000,000	---	7,600,000	---
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	280,000	---	280,000	---
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
NATIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT DURING DROUGHT	2,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
PRECIPITATION STUDIES [NATIONAL WEATEHER SERVICE]	450,000	---	450,000	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	130,000	---	130,000	---
STREAM GAGING [U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY]	600,000	---	600,000	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	850,000	---	850,000	---
TOTAL	18,560,000	---	16,810,000	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	30,700,000	---	27,200,000	---
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	90,747,000	59,415,000	108,487,000	73,766,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-14,762,000	---	-35,818,000	---
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	135,400,000		146,435,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

[N]	NAVIGATION
[FC]	FLOOD CONTROL
[BE]	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
[MP]	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
[FDP]	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
[SP]	SHORELINE PROTECTION
[SPEC]	SPECIAL
[COMP]	COMPREHENSIVE
[RDP]	RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECT
[RCP]	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
[PHASE I]	AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
[N]	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	95,000	95,000
[N]	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL &	20,000,000	15,000,000
[FC]	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE, AL	4,000,000	4,000,000
[FC]	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL	3,000,000	3,000,000
[N]	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL	5,500,000	5,500,000
	ALASKA		
[N]	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	---	1,000,000
	ARIZONA		
[FC]	CLIFTON, AZ	---	2,700,000
[FC]	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY, AZ (STAGE 2)	34,300,000	34,300,000
	ARKANSAS		
[MP]	BEAVER LAKE, AR	300,000	300,000
[FC]	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR	6,900,000	6,900,000
[N]	MCCLELLAN-KERR AR RIVER NAV. SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, A	6,500,000	9,500,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	---	4,100,000
	CALIFORNIA		
[FC]	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN, CA	2,100,000	2,100,000
[FC]	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	400,000	400,000
[FC]	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE, CA	3,500,000	3,500,000
[FC]	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS, CA	2,160,000	2,160,000
[FC]	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	9,000,000	9,000,000
	HANSEN DAM, CA	---	272,000
[FC]	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	1,900,000	1,900,000
[MP]	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	2,000,000	2,760,000
[N]	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	4,400,000	4,400,000
[FC]	PAJARO RIVER, CA	2,000,000	2,000,000
[FC]	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEK, CA	7,500,000	7,500,000
[N]	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR), CA	---	4,350,000
[N]	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	---	900,000
[FC]	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	5,000,000	5,000,000
[N]	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	3,900,000	3,900,000
[FC]	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA	1,050,000	1,050,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA	---	500,000
[FC]	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	13,470,000	13,470,000
	SAN DIEGO RIVER & MISSION BAY, CA	---	975,000
[N]	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	2,050,000	2,050,000
[FC]	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	5,500,000	5,500,000
[FC]	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	65,000,000	65,000,000
[FC]	SWEETWATER RIVER, CA	5,000,000	5,000,000
[FC]	WALNUT CREEK, CA	4,800,000	4,800,000
[FC]	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	1,700,000	1,700,000
	YOLO BASIN WETLANDS (SEC 1135), SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA	---	1,000,000
	COLORADO		
[FC]	WESTERLY CREEK, CO	1,242,000	1,242,000
	DELAWARE		
[FC]	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	130,000	130,000
	FLORIDA		
[N]	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	900,000	900,000
[FC]	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	18,800,000	18,800,000
[FC]	DADE COUNTY, FL	2,400,000	2,400,000
	DUVALL COUNTY, FL	---	2,400,000
[N]	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	---	2,500,000
[FC]	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL	300,000	300,000
	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	---	6,000,000
[BE]	MANATEE COUNTY, FL	2,320,000	2,320,000
[BE]	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	2,500,000	4,500,000
[BE]	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	2,067,000	2,067,000
	TAMPA BAY (PORT SUTTON), FL	---	500,000
	GEORGIA		
[FC]	GATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA	2,000,000	2,000,000
[MP]	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	19,000,000	19,000,000
	HAWAII		
	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	---	1,000,000
[N]	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	4,450,000	4,450,000
	ILLINOIS		
[FC]	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICTS, IL & MO	4,400,000	4,400,000
[FC]	EAST ST. LOUIS, IL	4,500,000	4,500,000
[FC]	LOVES PARK, IL	1,500,000	1,500,000
[N]	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	29,000,000	29,000,000
[N]	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, SECOND LOCK, IL & MO	75,000,000	75,000,000
[FC]	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	4,433,000	4,433,000
[FC]	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	---	4,300,000
	OLMSTEAD LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY	---	4,000,000
[N]	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.	14,900,000	17,000,000
	INDIANA		
[FC]	EVANSVILLE, IN	5,100,000	5,100,000
[FC]	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	3,390,000	3,390,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL - CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	IOWA		
	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER & GREENBELT, IA...........	---	550,000
[FC]	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, & MO.........	905,000	905,000
	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE, IA.............................	---	3,000,000
	KANSAS		
[FC]	GREAT BEND, KS..	9,000,000	9,000,000
[FC]	HALSTEAD, KS..	2,200,000	2,200,000
	KENTUCKY		
	SALYERSVILLE, KY......................................	---	400,000
[FC]	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY...................................	250,000	250,000
	LOUISIANA		
[FC]	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA...........................	2,659,000	2,659,000
[FC]	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	11,655,000	11,655,000
[FC]	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)....	4,210,000	4,210,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA...................	1,157,000	1,157,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	5,500,000	11,000,000
[FC]	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)......	15,900,000	15,900,000
[FC]	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST. TAMMANY PARISH, LA..........	730,000	730,000
[N]	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	39,147,000	92,636,000
[FC]	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LEVEE AND BANK STABILIZAT	---	3,820,000
[FC]	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)..	3,700,000	3,700,000
	MARYLAND		
[BE]	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD........................	14,800,000	14,800,000
	MINNESOTA		
[FC]	BASSETT CREEK, MN.....................................	8,505,000	8,505,000
[FC]	CHASKA, MN..	4,400,000	4,400,000
[N]	DULUTH SUPERIOR CHANL EXTENSION, MN & WI..............	---	1,000,000
[FC]	ROCHESTER, MN...	8,500,000	8,500,000
	ST. PAUL, MN..	---	500,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS...................................	---	100,000
[FC]	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN, MS..........................	3,000,000	3,000,000
[FC]	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL..............	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MISSOURI		
[FC]	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO...................	10,100,000	10,100,000
	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO..........................	---	1,240,000
[FC]	CAPE GIRARDEAU-JACKSON, MO............................	7,700,000	7,700,000
[FC]	HANNIBAL, MO..	1,460,000	1,460,000
[MP]	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO.................	3,495,000	3,495,000
	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN (VALLEY PARK LEVEE), MO...........	---	500,000
[N]	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	4,800,000	4,800,000
	NEBRASKA		
[FC]	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.........	83,000	1,060,000
[FC]	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.............	2,905,000	2,905,000
	PLATTE RIVER FLOOD & RELATED STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL PORGRAM, NE....................................	---	1,500,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
[N]	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME.......	75,000	75,000
	NEW JERSEY		
[N]	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ....................................	5,537,000	5,537,000
[BE]	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ..................	3,200,000	3,200,000
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF CAMDEN, NJ(BECKETT S	---	3,290,000
[FC]	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ...............	3,250,000	3,250,000
[BE]	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ......................	29,000,000	29,000,000
	NEW MEXICO		
[FC]	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM........................	2,000,000	2,000,000
[FC]	ALBUQUERQUE NORTH DIVERSION CHANNEL, NM...............	200,000	200,000
[FC]	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM............	---	1,300,000
[FC]	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT, NM...	1,417,000	1,417,000
	NEW YORK		
	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY, PT.I, NY..	---	350,000
[BE]	FIRE ISLAND INLET-JONES INLET,NY 1962 ACT.............	3,700,000	3,700,000
[N]	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY..................................	2,650,000	2,650,000
[N]	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.........	31,000,000	31,000,000
[N]	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY..................................	---	3,000,000
[FC]	YONKERS, NY...	355,000	355,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
[N]	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC.......	2,900,000	2,900,000
[FC]	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC....................	1,810,000	1,810,000
[FC]	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC.......................	1,190,000	1,190,000
[FC]	FALLS LAKE, NC..	2,500,000	2,500,000
	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC...........................	---	182,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
[FC]	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND....................................	8,900,000	8,900,000
[FC]	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND................................	25,400,000	25,400,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL - CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	OHIO		
[FC]	MILL CREEK, OH..	11,200,000	11,200,000
[FC]	SENECAVILLE LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH [DAM SAFET	835,000	835,000
	OKLAHOMA		
[FC]	MINGO CREEK, OK..	13,600,000	12,600,000
	TULSA & WEST TULSA, OK.................................	---	975,000
	OREGON		
[N]	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA....................	69,000,000	69,000,000
[MP]	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA..................	1,900,000	1,900,000
[FC]	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.....................................	3,000,000	3,000,000
[FC]	WILLOW CREEK DAM, OR...................................	---	150,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
[N]	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA..	31,000,000	31,000,000
[FC]	LOCK HAVEN, PA...	18,600,000	13,600,000
[N]	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &.	28,300,000	28,300,000
[BE]	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA [PERMANENT]................	4,170,000	4,170,000
[FC]	TURTLE CREEK, PA.......................................	936,000	936,000
	PUERTO RICO		
[FC]	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR........................	18,200,000	18,200,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
[N]	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC..................................	11,400,000	11,400,000
	TENNESSEE		
	CLARKSVILLE, TN STREAMBANK EROSION......................	---	550,000
	TEXAS		
[FC]	CLEAR CREEK, TX..	3,700,000	3,700,000
[FC]	BOGGY CREEK, AUSTIN, TX................................	2,263,000	2,263,000
[FC]	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX...........................	17,400,000	17,400,000
[FC]	EL PASO, TX..	9,000,000	9,000,000
[N]	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX....................................	11,000,000	11,000,000
[FC]	JOE POOL LAKE, TX......................................	600,000	600,000
[FC]	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX.....	11,200,000	11,200,000
[N]	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX............................	1,000,000	1,000,000
[FC]	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX...................................	4,900,000	4,900,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK..............	---	5,000,000
[FC]	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX....................	7,100,000	7,100,000
[FC]	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON, TX..............................	12,600,000	12,600,000
[FC]	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX......................................	4,700,000	4,700,000
[FC]	TEXAS CITY AND VICINITY, TX............................	848,000	848,000
[N]	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX...................................	---	9,200,000
	UTAH		
[FC]	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT...................................	9,070,000	9,070,000
	VERMONT		
	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN, TOWNSEND & BALL MOUNTAIN DAMS	---	900,000
	VIRGINIA		
[N]	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA........................	100,000	100,000
[FC]	RICHMOND, [LOCAL PROTECTION], VA.......................	18,000,000	18,000,000
[FC]	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA........	2,300,000	2,300,000
	WASHINGTON		
[MP]	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA......................	3,800,000	3,800,000
[MP]	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID..	15,800,000	18,500,000
[N]	GRAYS HARBOR, WA.......................................	10,500,000	10,500,000
[MP]	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	18,400,000	18,400,000
[FC]	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA [DAM SAFETY]......................	8,700,000	8,700,000
[FC]	ZINTEL CANYON DAM, WA..................................	---	6,300,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
[N]	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH......................	46,300,000	46,300,000
[FC]	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	36,800,000	70,800,000
[FC]	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV.............................	1,000,000	1,000,000
[N]	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM, WV..............................	16,200,000	-16,200,000
	WISCONSIN		
[FC]	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI.......................	6,300,000	6,300,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL [1965 ACT].......................	9,500,000	9,500,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS [SECTION 103]...........	3,000,000	3,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION [SECTION 1	10,000,000	10,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION................................	14,930,000	14,930,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS [SECTION 205]...................	30,000,000	28,500,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES.........	25,000	25,000
	INLAND WATERWAY USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES..........	160,000	160,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES [SECTION 111].............	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS [SECTION 107]......................	18,000,000	18,000,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	5,000,000	2,500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL - CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)....	500,000	500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	-69,639,000	-126,273,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED UNOBLIGATED BALANCES........	---	-200,000,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL......................	1,226,000,000	1,143,086,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

[N]	NAVIGATION
[FC]	FLOOD CONTROL
[BE]	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
[MP]	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
	SURVEYS:		
	GENERAL STUDIES:		
[FC]	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION [COMPREHENSIVE STUDY], AR.	430,000	430,000
[FC]	HELENA ARKANSAS AND VICINITY, AR.	500,000	500,000
[FDP]	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS STUDY, AR.	75,000	150,000
[FC]	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR.	300,000	300,000
[FDP]	ALEXANDRIA, LA.	---	300,000
[FDP]	BIRDS POINT, NEW MADRID ALTERNATE STUDY, MO.	350,000	350,000
[FDP]	ST. FRANCIS RIVER MO. & AR. [FISH AND WILDLIFE]	350,000	350,000
[FC]	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	295,000	295,000
[FC]	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:		
	BAYOU RAPIDES DRAINAGE STRUCTURE & PUMP PLANT	---	200,000
	LOWER WHITE RIVER [BIG CREEK AND TRIBS], AR.	385,000	385,000
	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY, LA.	---	300,000
[FC]	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	2,685,000	3,560,000
[FC]			
[FC]			
[FC] [N]	**CONSTRUCTION**		
[FC]			
[FC]	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	109,875,000	109,875,000
[FC]	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR.	800,000	800,000
[FC]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	20,300,000	20,300,000
[FC]	ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO.	10,200,000	10,200,000
[FC]	TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	[2,000,000]	[2,000,000]
[FC]	RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.	2,000,000	2,000,000
[FC]	WEST MEMPHIS, AR & VICINITY	---	2,000,000
[FC]	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.	32,000,000	32,000,000
[FC]	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.	11,700,000	11,700,000
[FC]	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.	4,260,000	4,260,000
	MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS.	---	200,000
[FC]	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA.	---	400,000
[FC]	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES [INCLUDING COW PEN CREEK	---	236,000
[FC]	SARDIS DAM, MS [DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE]	555,000	555,000
[FC]	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	[29,225,000]	[29,225,000]
[FC]	BACKWATER FOWL MITIGATION LANDS	250,000	250,000
[FC]	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER	4,600,000	4,600,000
[FC]	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	12,000,000	12,000,000
[FC]	RESTUDY UNIT	5,900,000	5,900,000
[FC]	TRIBUTARIES	4,200,000	4,200,000
[FC]	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS	2,275,000	2,275,000
[FC]	MEMPHIS HARBOR [ENSLEY BERM] TN.	1,700,000	1,700,000
[FC]	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS.	3,500,000	3,500,000
[FC]	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN.	100,000	100,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	226,215,000	229,051,000
	MAINTENANCE		
[FC]	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	62,887,000	62,887,000
[FC]	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR.	679,000	679,000
[FC]	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR.	151,000	151,000
[FC]	MISS RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, TN.	6,922,000	6,922,000
[FC]	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO.	7,998,000	9,593,000
[FC]	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA.	2,387,000	2,387,000
[FC]	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR.	521,000	521,000
[FC]	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.	7,105,000	7,105,000
[FC]	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA.	170,000	170,000
[FC]	BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBS, LA.	155,000	155,000
[FC]	BONNET CARRE, LA.	653,000	653,000
[FC]	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA.	63,000	63,000
[FC]	OLD RIVER, LA.	6,715,000	6,715,000
[FC]	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.	1,917,000	1,917,000
[N]	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS.	216,000	216,000
[N]	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS.	157,000	157,000
[FC]	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	[16,132,000]	[20,932,000]
[FC]	ARKABUTLA LAKE	2,359,000	3,109,000
[FC]	BACKWATER	424,000	424,000
[FC]	BIG SUNFLOWER	474,000	474,000
[FC]	ENID LAKE	2,845,000	4,095,000
[FC]	GREENWOOD	558,000	558,000
[FC]	GRENADA LAKE	3,579,000	4,829,000
[FC]	MAIN STEM	893,000	1,193,000
[FC]	SARDIS LAKE	3,212,000	4,462,000
[FC]	TRIBUTARIES	1,020,000	1,020,000
[FC]	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHANNEL	399,000	399,000
[FC]	YAZOO CITY	369,000	369,000
[FC]	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.	3,048,000	3,048,000
[N]	MEMPHIS HARBOR [MCKELLAR LAKE], TN.	1,239,000	1,239,000
[FC]	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	1,082,000	1,082,000
[FC]	MAPPING	803,000	803,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	121,000,000	127,395,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	-15,400,000	-15,400,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES.	334,500,000	344,606,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
[FC] FLOOD CONTROL
[FDP] FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
[N] NAVIGATION

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
[N]	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	4,057,000	6,439,000
	ALABAMA - COOSA & ACF BASIN COMPREHENSIVE WATER RESOURCE STUDY, AL, FL & GA	---	1,000,000
[N]	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	679,000	679,000
[N]	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	9,292,000	14,000,000
[N]	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	206,000	206,000
[N]	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	429,000	429,000
[N]	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY [MOBILE DISTRICT], AL	2,766,000	2,766,000
[MP]	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	4,233,000	4,233,000
[N]	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	13,401,000	17,000,000
[N]	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	343,000	343,000
[MP]	ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,352,000	3,352,000
[N]	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	13,676,000	18,000,000
[MP]	WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,460,000	5,460,000
	ALASKA		
[N]	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,776,000	1,776,000
[N]	BETHEL SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	498,000	498,000
[FC]	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,197,000	1,197,000
[N]	CORDOVA HARBOR, AK	405,000	405,000
[N]	DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	787,000	787,000
[N]	HOMER SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	413,000	413,000
[N]	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	253,000	253,000
[N]	NOME HARBOR, AK	490,000	490,000
	ARIZONA		
[FC]	ALAMO DAM, AZ	750,000	750,000
[FC]	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	605,000	605,000
[FC]	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	68,000	68,000
	ARKANSAS		
[MP]	BEAVER LAKE, AR	14,718,000	14,718,000
[MP]	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	2,997,000	2,997,000
[FC]	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	877,000	877,000
[MP]	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,424,000	4,424,000
[MP]	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,917,000	4,917,000
[MP]	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	2,955,000	2,955,000
[FC]	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	974,000	974,000
[FC]	DIERKS LAKE, AR	824,000	824,000
[FC]	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	851,000	851,000
[MP]	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,202,000	4,202,000
[N]	HELENA HARBOR, AR	460,000	460,000
[N]	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	22,403,000	22,403,000
[FC]	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,229,000	2,229,000
[MP]	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	2,745,000	2,745,000
[FC]	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,072,000	1,072,000
[MP]	NORFORK LAKE, AR	4,082,000	4,082,000
[N]	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	575,000	575,000
[N]	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	4,831,000	4,831,000
[MP]	OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,522,000	3,522,000
[N]	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,243,000	2,243,000
	CALIFORNIA		
[FC]	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,394,000	1,394,000
[N]	BODEGA BAY, CA	795,000	795,000
[FC]	BUCHANAN DAM - H.V. EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,274,000	1,274,000
[N]	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,421,000	3,421,000
[FC]	COYOTE VALLEY DAM - LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	1,663,000	1,663,000
[N]	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	130,000	130,000
[FC]	DRY CREEK - WARM SPRINGS LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	2,431,000	2,431,000
[FC]	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	221,000	221,000
[FC]	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,271,000	1,271,000
[N]	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,177,000	4,177,000
[FC]	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	2,092,000	2,092,000
[FC]	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	2,129,000	2,129,000
[N]	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	155,000	760,000
[N]	MARINA DEL REY, CA	1,700,000	1,700,000
[FC]	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	187,000	187,000
[FC]	MOJAVE RIVER RESERVOIR, CA	184,000	184,000
[N]	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,025,000	1,025,000
[FC]	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,673,000	1,673,000
[MP]	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	751,000	751,000
[N]	NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA	613,000	613,000
[N]	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,091,000	2,091,000
	OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	---	2,700,000
[N]	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	65,000	65,000
[FC]	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,972.000	1,972,000
[N]	PORT HUENEME, CA	802,000	802,000
[N]	PORT SAN LUIS, CA	1,288,000	1,288,000
[N]	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,176,000	2,176,000
[N]	SACRAMENTO RIVER - SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	70,000	70,000
[N]	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES [DEBRIS CONTROL], CA	721,000	721,000
[N]	SACRAMENTO RIVER [30 FOOT PROJECT], CA	2,115,000	2,115,000
[N]	SAN DIEGO RIVER - MISSION BAY, CA	877,000	877,000
[N]	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,323,000	2,323,000
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	---	3,630,000
[N]	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,530,000	1,530,000
	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY [DRIFT REMOVAL], CA	1,808,000	1,808,000
[N]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,385,000	1,385,000
[N]	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	2,566,000	2,566,000
[N]	SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	980,000	980,000
[FC]	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,962,000	1,982,000
[N]	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	750,000	750,000
	SEPULVEDA DAM, LACDA, CA	---	2,500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[FC]	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,408,000	1,406,000
[N]	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	859,000	859,000
[FC]	TERMINUS DAM - LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,216,000	1,216,000
[N]	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	1,270,000	1,270,000
[N]	YUBA RIVER, CA	25,000	25,000
	COLORADO		
[FC]	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	333,000	333,000
[FC]	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	650,000	650,000
[FC]	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	441,000	441,000
[FC]	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,021,000	2,021,000
[FC]	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	701,000	701,000
	CONNECTICUT		
[FC]	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	266,000	256,000
[FC]	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	232,000	232,000
[FC]	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	255,000	255,000
[FC]	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	634,000	634,000
[FC]	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	333,000	333,000
[N]	NORTH COVE, CT	758,000	758,000
[FC]	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	220,000	220,000
[FC]	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	120,000	120,000
[FC]	THOMASTON DAM, CT	425,000	425,000
[FC]	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	470,000	470,000
	DELAWARE		
	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL, ST. GEORGES BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	---	7,000,000
[N]	INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	325,000	325,000
[N]	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BA	17,000	17,000
[N]	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE.	22,402,000	22,402,000
[N]	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	150,000	150,000
[N]	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,164,000	3,164,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS [DRIFT REMOVAL], DC	585,000	585,000
[N]	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	500,000	500,000
[N]	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	21,000	21,000
	FLORIDA		
[N]	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	188,000	188,000
[N]	BLACKWATER RIVER, FL	8,000	8,000
[N]	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	2,315,000	2,315,000
[N]	CARRABELLE HARBOR, FL	277,000	277,000
[FC]	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN, FL	4,627,000	4,877,000
[N]	CHANNELS, NAPLES TO BIG MARCO PASS, FL	907,000	907,000
[N]	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	1,123,000	1,123,000
[N]	CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	2,072,000	2,072,000
[N]	EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	465,000	465,000
[N]	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	910,000	910,000
[N]	FORT MYERS BEACH, FL	925,000	925,000
[N]	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	651,000	651,000
[N]	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY CALOOSAHATCHEE R. TO ANCLOTE R.	366,000	366,000
[N]	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	1,110,000	1,110,000
[N]	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST. JOHNS RIVER	2,356,000	2,356,000
[N]	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	1,223,000	1,223,000
[MP]	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,169,000	4,169,000
[N]	JOHNS PASS, FL	330,000	330,000
[N]	LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	60,000	60,000
[N]	LONG BOAT PASS, FL	800,000	800,000
[N]	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	257,000	257,000
[N]	NEW PASS, FL	1,205,000	1,205,000
[N]	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	1,638,000	1,638,000
[N]	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	28,000	28,000
[N]	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	944,000	944,000
[N]	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	31,000	31,000
[N]	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	107,000	107,000
[N]	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	114,000	114,000
[N]	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	67,000	67,000
[N]	PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	637,000	637,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,196,000	3,196,000
[N]	ST. AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	827,000	827,000
[N]	ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	130,000	130,000
[N]	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	2,196,000	2,196,000
	GEORGIA		
[N]	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	3,766,000	3,766,000
[MP]	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,872,000	4,872,000
[N]	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY [SAVANNAH DISTRICT], GA	947,000	947,000
[N]	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,533,000	7,533,000
[MP]	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	5,707,000	5,707,000
[MP]	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	3,278,000	3,278,000
[MP]	J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	7,671,000	7,671,000
[MP]	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	5,422,000	5,422,000
[MP]	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	3,925,000	3,925,000
[N]	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	5,173,000	5,173,000
[N]	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	245,000	245,000
[MP]	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,908,000	4,908,000
	HAWAII		
[N]	BARBER'S POINT HARBOR, HI	55,000	55,000
[N]	KAUNAKAKAI HARBOR, HAWAII	55,000	65,000
[N]	PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI	65,000	65,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	IDAHO		
[MP]	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,939,000	2,939,000
[MP]	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	6,105,000	6,105,000
[FC]	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	683,000	683,000
	ILLINOIS		
[N]	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL	157,000	157,000
[FC]	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,365,000	3,366,000
[N]	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	1,133,000	1,133,000
[N]	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	1,923,000	1,923,000
[FC]	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	265,000	265,000
[N]	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL [LMVD PORTION]	1,647,000	1,647,000
[N]	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL AND IN	14,356,000	14,355,000
[N]	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,343,000	1,343,000
[FC]	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,157,000	4,157,000
[N]	MISS RIVER BTWN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN	40,518,000	40,518,000
[N]	MISS RVR BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS, IL & MN [LMVD PO	9,936,000	9,935,000
	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	---	150,000
[FC]	RENO LAKE, IL	3,426,000	3,426,000
[N]	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	908,000	908,000
	INDIANA		
[FC]	BEVERLY SHORES, IN	21,000	21,000
[FC]	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	634,000	634,000
[N]	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	143,000	143,000
[N]	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	340,000	340,000
[FC]	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	604,000	604,000
[FC]	CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN	644,000	644,000
[FC]	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	505,000	505,000
[N]	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	597,000	597,000
[N]	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	52,000	52,000
[FC]	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	450,000	450,000
[FC]	MONROE LAKE, IN	929,000	929,000
[FC]	PATOKA LAKE, IN	478,000	478,000
[FC]	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	466,000	466,000
	IOWA		
[FC]	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,637,000	2,637,000
[N]	FORT MADISON HARBOR, IA	68,000	68,000
[FC]	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA..	52,000	52,000
[N]	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,380,000	6,380,000
[FC]	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,480,000	1,480,000
[FC]	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,342,000	3,342,000
[FC]	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,237,000	3,237,000
[N]	SMALL NAV PROJ AT SIOUX CITY, IOWA - SECTION 107, IA..	5,000	5,000
	KANSAS		
[FC]	CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,364,000	1,364,000
[FC]	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,002,000	1,002,000
[FC]	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	450,000	450,000
[FC]	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	723,000	723,000
[FC]	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	976,000	976,000
[FC]	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	961,000	961,000
[FC]	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,100,000	1,100,000
[FC]	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,604,000	1,604,000
[FC]	MARION LAKE, KS	740,000	740,000
[FC]	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,376,000	1,376,000
[FC]	MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,039,000	2,039,000
[FC]	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	755,000	755,000
[FC]	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,503,000	1,503,000
[FC]	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,261,000	1,261,000
[FC]	TORONTO LAKE, KS	388,000	388,000
[FC]	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,360,000	1,360,000
[FC]	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,171,000	1,171,000
	KENTUCKY		
[MP]	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BA[illegible]Y, KY	4,786,000	4,786,000
[FC]	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,098,000	1,098,000
[N]	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,030,000	1,030,000
[FC]	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	718,000	718,000
[FC]	CARR FORK LAKE, KY	846,000	846,000
[FC]	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	636,000	636,000
[FC]	DEWEY LAKE, KY	927,000	927,000
[FC]	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,028,000	1,028,000
[FC]	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	717,000	717,000
[N]	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,161,000	1,161,000
[FC]	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,251,000	1,251,000
[N]	HICKMAN HARBOR, KY	513,000	513,000
[N]	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,343,000	1,343,000
[MP]	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	981,000	981,000
[N]	LICKING RIVER, KY	13,000	13,000
[FC]	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	673,000	673,000
[FC]	MIDDLESBORO, KY	37,000	37,000
[FC]	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,298,000	1,298,000
[N]	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV....	36,436,000	41,060,000
[N]	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	4,849,000	4,849,000
[FC]	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	723,000	723,000
[FC]	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,599,000	1,599,000
[FC]	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	674,000	674,000
[MP]	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	4,809,000	4,809,000
[FC]	YATESVILLE LAKE KY	661,000	661,000
	LOUISANA		
[N]	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	3,607,000	3,737,000
[N]	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	1,900,000	1,900,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[FC]	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	368,000	368,000
[FC]	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	38,000	38,000
[N]	BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	188,000	168,000
[N]	BAYOU TECHE, LA	1,005,000	1,005,000
[N]	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	275,000	275,000
[FC]	CADDO LAKE, LA	97,000	97,000
[N]	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	3,475,000	3,665,000
[N]	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,535,000	2,535,000
[N]	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	10,890,000	10,890,000
[N]	HOUMA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LA	165,000	645,000
[N]	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	258,000	258,000
[N]	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	68,000	68,000
[N]	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,320,000	1,320,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA	52,000,000	58,222,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	7,280,000	7,280,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,040,000	2,040,000
[N]	PEARL RIVER, MS	1,049,000	1,646,000
[N]	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	3,567,000	3,567,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,525,000	1,525,000
[FC]	WALLACE LAKE, LA	156,000	156,000
[N]	WATERWAY - EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	232,000	232,000
	MARYLAND		
[N]	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA	9,233,000	9,233,000
	BALTIMORE HARBOR [PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS]	376,000	378,000
	BALTIMORE HARBOR [DRIFT REMOVAL], MD	294,000	294,000
[FC]	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	79,000	79,000
[N]	FISHING CREEK, MD	350,000	350,000
[N]	HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD	30,000	30,000
[FC]	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,203,000	1,203,000
[N]	NEALE SOUND, MD	517,000	517,000
[N]	OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET & SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	450,000	450,000
[N]	ST. JEROME CREEK, MD	372,000	372,000
[N]	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
[FC]	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	431,000	431,000
[FC]	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	444,000	444,000
[FC]	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	291,000	291,000
[N]	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	6,387,000	6,387,000
[FC]	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS, MA	154,000	154,000
[N]	CHATHAM [STAGE] HARBOR, MA	907,000	907,000
[FC]	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	170,000	170,000
[FC]	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	285,000	285,000
[N]	GREEN HARBOR, MA	335,000	335,000
[FC]	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	326,000	326,000
[FC]	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	541,000	541,000
[FC]	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	460,000	460,000
[FC]	NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	327,000	327,000
[N]	NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	461,000	461,000
[FC]	TULLY LAKE, MA	439,000	439,000
[FC]	WEST HILL DAM, MA	386,000	386,000
[FC]	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	302,000	302,000
	MICHIGAN		
[N]	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	238,000	238,000
[N]	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	78,000	78,000
[N]	AU SABLE HARBOR, MI	266,000	266,000
[N]	BIG BAY HARBOR, MI	135,000	135,000
[N]	BOLLES HARBOR, MI	253,000	253,000
[N]	CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	168,000	168,000
[N]	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	391,000	391,000
[N]	CHANNELS IN STRAITS OF MACKINAC, MI	213,000	213,000
[N]	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	24,000	24,000
[N]	CHEBOYGAN HARBOR, MI	166,000	166,000
[N]	CLINTON RIVER, MI	68,000	68,000
[N]	DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,963,000	2,963,000
[N]	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	158,000	158,000
[N]	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	870,000	870,000
[N]	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	121,000	121,000
[N]	GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI	44,000	44,000
[N]	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	781,000	781,000
[N]	HARRISVILLE HARBOR, MI	161,000	161,000
[N]	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	610,000	610,000
[N]	INLAND ROUTE, MI	19,000	13,000
[N]	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	664,000	664,000
[N]	LELAND HARBOR, MI	117,000	117,000
[N]	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	111,000	111,000
[N]	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	120,000	120,000
[N]	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	510,000	510,000
[N]	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	214,000	214,000
[N]	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	709,000	709,000
[N]	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	236,000	236,000
[N]	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	23,000	23,000
[N]	MONROE HARBOR, MI	188,000	188,000
[N]	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	277,000	277,000
[N]	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	2,860,000	2,860,000
[N]	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	161,000	161,000
[N]	PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	210,000	210,000
[N]	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	369,000	369,000
[N]	ROUGE RIVER, MI	724,000	724,000
[N]	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	4,050,000	4,050,000
[FC]	SEBEWAING RIVER [ICE JAM REMOVAL], MI	15,000	15,000
[N]	ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	910,000	910,000
[N]	ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	711,000	711,000
[MP]	ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	12,717,000	12,717,000
[N]	WHITEFISH POINT HARBOR, MI	94,000	94,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	MINNESOTA		
[FC]	BIGSTONE LAKE, WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	160,000	160,000
[N]	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,027,000	4,027,000
[FC]	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	312,000	312,000
[FC]	LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	219,000	219,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI AND MINNEAPOLIS, MN	36,245,000	36,245,000
[N]	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	272,000	272,000
[FC]	ORWELL LAKE, MN	324,000	324,000
[FC]	RED LAKE RIVER, MN	85,000	85,000
[N]	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	1,745,000	1,745,000
	SAUK LAKE, MN	---	100,000
[N]	ST. PAUL SMALL BOAT HARBOR, MN	15,000	15,000
[N]	TWO HARBORS, MN	2,635,000	2,635,000
[N]	WINONA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, MN	15,000	15,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
[N]	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	725,000	725,000
[N]	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	149,000	149,000
[FC]	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	249,000	249,000
[FC]	GRENADA LAKE, MS	100,000	100,000
[N]	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,302,000	2,302,000
[N]	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	164,000	164,000
[FC]	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,371,000	1,371,000
[N]	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,398,000	4,398,000
[N]	PASS CHRISTIAN HARBOR, MS	323,000	323,000
[N]	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	379,000	379,000
[N]	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS	181,000	181,000
[N]	YAZOO RIVER, MS	275,000	275,000
	MISSOURI		
[N]	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	380,000	380,000
[MP]	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,469,000	5,469,000
[FC]	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	1,950,000	1,950,000
[N]	HANNIBAL HARBOR, MO	68,000	68,000
[MP]	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,031,000	8,031,000
[FC]	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	840,000	840,000
[FC]	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	555,000	555,000
[N]	MISS. RVR BETWN OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS, IL & MO	10,971,000	10,971,000
[FC]	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,402,000	1,402,000
[FC]	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,047,000	1,047,000
[MP]	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	2,930,000	2,930,000
[MP]	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	4,749,000	4,749,000
[FC]	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	147,000	147,000
	MONTANA		
[MP]	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,566,000	4,566,000
[MP]	LIBBY DAM, MT	3,898,000	3,898,000
	NEBRASKA		
[MP]	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,144,000	5,144,000
[FC]	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,296,000	1,296,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER, NE & SD	---	200,000
[FC]	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	640,000	640,000
[FC]	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	660,000	660,000
	NEVADA		
[FC]	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	381,000	381,000
[FC]	PINE-MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS, NV	87,000	87,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
[FC]	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	400,000	400,000
[FC]	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	355,000	355,000
[FC]	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	591,000	591,000
[N]	HAMPTON HARBOR, NH	288,000	288,000
[FC]	HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,009,000	1,009,000
[FC]	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	370,000	370,000
[FC]	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	558,000	558,000
	NEW JERSEY		
[N]	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	850,000	850,000
[N]	CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	50,000	50,000
[N]	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	385,000	385,000
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,280,000	3,280,000
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	11,410,000	11,410,000
[N]	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	190,000	190,000
[N]	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,529,000	2,529,000
[N]	NEWARK BAY HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	50,000	50,000
[N]	RARITAN RIVER, NJ	600,000	600,000
[N]	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	1,050,000	1,050,000
[N]	SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	30,000	30,000
[N]	SANDY HOOK BAY AT LEONARDO, NJ	880,000	880,000
[N]	SHARK RIVER, NJ	40,000	40,000
	NEW MEXICO		
[FC]	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,233,000	1,233,000
[FC]	COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,494,000	1,494,000
[FC]	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	869,000	869,000
[FC]	GALISTEO DAM, NM	216,000	216,000
[FC]	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	400,000	400,000
[FC]	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	705,000	705,000
[FC]	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	423,000	423,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	NEW YORK		
[FC]	ALMOND LAKE, NY	278,000	278,000
[FC]	ARKPORT DAM, NY	167,000	167,000
[N]	BAYRIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	1,417,000	1,417,000
[N]	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,122,000	3,122,000
[N]	BRONX RIVER, NY	720,000	720,000
[N]	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,507,000	1,507,000
[N]	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	75,000	75,000
[N]	CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	250,000	250,000
[N]	CONEY ISLAND CHANNEL, NY	720,000	720,000
[N]	CONEY ISLAND CREEK, NY	40,000	40,000
[N]	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	225,000	225,000
[N]	EAST CHESTER CREEK, NY	150,000	150,000
[N]	EAST RIVER, NY	1,410,000	1,410,000
[N]	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	630,000	630,000
[FC]	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	294,000	294,000
[N]	ECHO BAY HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
[N]	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	835,000	835,000
[N]	FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	690,000	690,000
[N]	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	140,000	140,000
[N]	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	50,000	50,000
[N]	HARLEM RIVER, NY	140,000	140,000
[N]	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
[N]	HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,102,000	2,102,000
[N]	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	660,000	660,000
[N]	JAMAICA BAY, NY	850,000	850,000
[N]	JONES INLET NY	40,000	40,000
[N]	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	30,000	30,000
[N]	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	60,000	60,000
[N]	MAMARONECK HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
[FC]	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,284,000	1,284,000
[N]	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	40,000	40,000
[N]	NEW ROCHELLE HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
[N]	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	2,705,000	2,705,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR [DRIFT REMOVAL], NY	3,290,000	3,290,000
[N]	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,279,000	4,279,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR [PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS]	605,000	605,000
[N]	NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	30,000	30,000
[N]	NORTHPORT HARBOR, NY	60,000	60,000
[N]	OAK ORCHARD HBR, NY	150,000	150,000
[N]	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	145,000	145,000
[N]	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	405,000	405,000
[N]	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	30,000	30,000
[N]	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	801,000	801,000
[N]	SHEEPSHEAD BAY, NY	40,000	40,000
[FC]	SOUTHERN NEW YORK PROJECTS, NY	2,106,000	2,106,000
[N]	TARRYTOWN HARBOR, NY	50,000	50,000
[N]	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	550,000	550,000
[FC]	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	1,077,000	1,077,000
[N]	WILSON HARBOR, NY	230,000	230,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
[N]	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY [WILMINGTON DISTRICT]	5,437,000	5,437,000
[FC]	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,039,000	1,039,000
[N]	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	418,000	418,000
[N]	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	675,000	675,000
[N]	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	481,000	856,000
[N]	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	579,000	579,000
[N]	CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	393,000	393,000
[FC]	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,048,000	1,198,000
[N]	FAR CREEK, NC	946,000	946,000
[N]	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	535,000	535,000
[N]	MANTEO [SHALLOWBAG] BAY, NC	5,117,000	5,117,000
	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	---	1,965,000
[N]	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	1,983,000	1,983,000
[N]	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	538,000	538,000
[N]	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	520,000	520,000
[N]	OCRACOKE INLET, NC	278,000	278,000
[N]	ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	395,000	395,000
[N]	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	786,000	786,000
[N]	WATERWAY CONNECTING PAMLICO SOUND AND BEAUFORT HARBOR,	245,000	245,000
[FC]	W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,537,000	1,537,000
[N]	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	4,612,000	6,463,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
[FC]	BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND	222,000	222,000
[MP]	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	6,390,000	6,330,000
[FC]	HOMME LAKE AND DAM, ND	100,000	100,000
[FC]	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	640,000	640,000
[FC]	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	336,000	336,000
	OHIO		
[FC]	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	519,000	519,000
[N]	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	267,000	267,000
[FC]	BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,336,000	2,336,000
[FC]	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	739,000	739,000
[FC]	CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH	479,000	479,000
[N]	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,362,000	3,362,000
[N]	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	220,000	220,000
[FC]	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	373,000	373,000
[FC]	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	777,000	777,000
[FC]	DILLON LAKE, OH	434,000	434,000
[N]	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	37,000	37,000
[N]	HURON HARBOR, OH	37,000	37,000
[N]	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,149,000	1,149,000
[FC]	MASSILLON, OH	20,000	20,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[FC]	MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	736,000	736,000
[FC]	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	794,000	794,000
[FC]	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	5,384,000	5,384,000
[FC]	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	177,000	177,000
[FC]	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	471,000	471,000
[N]	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
[N]	ROCKY RIVER, OH	250,000	250,000
[FC]	ROSEVILLE, OH	20,000	20,000
[N]	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	320,000	320,000
[N]	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	7,862,000	7,862,000
[FC]	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	326,000	326,000
[N]	VERMILION HARBOR, OH	275,000	275,000
[FC]	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	371,000	371,000
[N]	WEST HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
[FC]	WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH	586,000	586,000
	OKLAHOMA		
[FC]	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	390,000	390,000
[FC]	CANDY LAKE, OK	30,000	30,000
[FC]	BIRCH LAKE, OK	771,000	771,000
[MP]	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,641,000	1,641,000
[FC]	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,409,000	1,409,000
[FC]	COPAN LAKE, OK	919,000	919,000
[MP]	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,647,000	3,647,000
[MP]	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,018,000	3,018,000
[FC]	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	792,000	792,000
[FC]	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	499,000	499,000
[FC]	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	589,000	589,000
[FC]	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,281,000	1,281,000
[FC]	HULAH LAKE, OK	770,000	770,000
[FC]	KAW LAKE, OK	1,790,000	1,790,000
[MP]	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	2,188,000	2,188,000
[FC]	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,206,000	1,206,000
[FC]	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	566,000	656,000
[FC]	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	10,000	10,000
[FC]	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	876,000	876,000
[MP]	ROBERT S. KERR L&D AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,149,000	3,149,000
[FC]	SARDIS LAKE, OK	856,000	856,000
[FC]	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,727,000	2,927,000
[MP]	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	2,864,000	2,864,000
[FC]	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,240,000	1,240,000
[MP]	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	2,865,000	2,865,000
[FC]	WISTER LAKE, OK	6,305,000	6,305,000
	OREGON		
[FC]	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	431,000	431,000
[FC]	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	159,000	159,000
[MP]	BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM-LAKE BONNEVILLE, OR	11,645,000	11,645,000
[N]	CHETCO RIVER, OR	6,000	6,000
[N]	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R. BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTL	10,883,000	10,883,000
[N]	COLUMBIA RIVER AT MOUTH, OR & WA	8,571,000	8,571,000
[N]	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES, OR.	378,000	378,000
[N]	COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS, OR	172,000	172,000
[N]	COOS BAY, OR	4,166,000	4,166,000
[N]	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	274,000	274,000
[FC]	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	630,000	630,000
[MP]	COUGAR LAKE, OR	943,000	943,000
[MP]	DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,698,000	1,698,000
[FC]	DORENA LAKE, OR	497,000	497,000
[FC]	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	357,000	357,000
[FC]	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	592,000	592,000
[MP]	GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,004,000	2,004,000
[MP]	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	562,000	562,000
[MP]	JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, OR	12,535,000	12,535,000
[MP]	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,708,000	2,708,000
[MP]	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,085,000	3,085,000
[MP]	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR	10,845,000	10,845,000
[N]	PORT ORFORD, OR	105,000	105,000
[N]	ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	532,000	532,000
[N]	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	727,000	727,000
[N]	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	216,000	216,000
[N]	TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR, OR	6,000	3,756,000
[N]	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,260,000	1,260,000
[FC]	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	104,000	104,000
[N]	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	709,000	709,000
[FC]	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	437,000	437,000
[N]	YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	1,151,000	1,151,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
[N]	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,075,000	6,075,000
[FC]	ALVIN R. BUSH DAM, PA	402,000	402,000
[FC]	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	152,000	152,000
[FC]	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	731,000	731,000
[FC]	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,367,000	1,367,000
[FC]	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,140,000	1,140,000
[FC]	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,135,000	1,135,000
[FC]	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,390,000	1,390,000
[FC]	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	410,000	410,000
[N]	ERIE HARBOR, PA	87,000	87,000
[FC]	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	777,000	777,000
[FC]	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	508,000	508,000
[FC]	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA	445,000	445,000
[FC]	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR, PA	265,000	265,000
[FC]	JOHNSTOWN, PA	6,000	906,000
[FC]	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,464,000	1,464,000
[FC]	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,038,000	1,038,000
[FC]	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	580,000	680,000
[N]	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	11,675,000	11,675,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[FC]	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	379,000	379,000
[FC]	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	5,000	5,000
[FC]	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	1,978,000	1,978,000
[N]	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,400,000	1,400,000
[FC]	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,017,000	2,017,000
[FC]	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	236,000	236,000
[FC]	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,278,000	1,278,000
[FC]	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,103,000	1,103,000
[FC]	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	308,000	308,000
[FC]	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	803,000	803,000
[FC]	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	1,938,000	1,938,000
[FC]	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	2,036,000	2,036,000

PUERTO RICO

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[N]	ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	650,000	650,000
[N]	MAYAQUEZ HARBOR, PR	200,000	200,000
[N]	PONCE HARBOR, PR	165,000	165,000
[N]	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	1,000,000	1,000,000

SOUTH CAROLINA

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[N]	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	2,282,000	2,282,000
[N]	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	2,750,000	2,750,000
[N]	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,246,000	3,246,000
[N]	FOLLY RIVER, SC	535,000	535,000
[N]	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	1,869,000	1,869,000
[N]	JEREMY CREEK, SC	1,000	1,000
[N]	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	144,000	144,000
[N]	MURRELLS INLET, CS	146,000	146,000
[N]	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	894,000	894,000
[N]	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	608,000	608,000
[N]	TOWN CREEK, SC	444,000	444,000

SOUTH DAKOTA

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[MP]	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,651,000	6,651,000
[FC]	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	274,000	274,000
[FC]	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	147,000	147,000
[MP]	FT. RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,334,000	7,334,000
[MP]	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,006,000	8,006,000

TENNESSEE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[MP]	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	3,619,000	3,619,000
[MP]	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,607,000	5,607,000
[MP]	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,159,000	3,159,000
[MP]	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,206,000	3,206,000
[MP]	J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,031,000	3,031,000
[MP]	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,258,000	5,258,000
[N]	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	11,049,000	11,049,000
[N]	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	675,000	675,000

TEXAS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[FC]	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	505,000	505,000
[PC]	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX	651,000	651,000
[FC]	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	876,000	876,000
[FC]	BELTON LAKE, TX	1,731,000	1,731,000
[FC]	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,254,000	1,254,000
[N]	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,025,000	3,025,000
[FC]	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,497,000	1,497,000
[FC]	CANYON LAKE, TX	1,008,000	1,008,000
[N]	CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	720,000	720,000
[N]	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	600,000	600,000
	CHANNEL TO RED BLUFF, TX	---	400,000
[N]	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW, TX	1,725,000	1,725,000
[FC]	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	137,000	137,000
[N]	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,037,000	5,037,000
[MP]	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	4,314,000	4,314,000
[FC]	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	8,000	8,000
[FC]	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	1,510,000	1,510,000
[N]	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	2,836,000	2,836,000
[N]	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	41,000	41,000
[FC]	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,040,000	1,040,000
[FC]	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,606,000	1,606,000
[N]	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	13,185,000	13,185,000
[FC]	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	655,000	655,000
[N]	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,697,000	6,697,000
[FC]	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	519,000	519,000
[FC]	LAKE KEMP, TX	178,000	178,000
[FC]	LAVON LAKE, TX	1,970,000	1,970,000
[FC]	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	1,903,000	1,903,000
[N]	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,734,000	1,734,000
[FC]	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,052,000	1,052,000
[FC]	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,026,000	1,026,000
[FC]	O. C. FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	777,000	777,000
[FC]	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,081,000	1,081,000
[FC]	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	892,000	892,000
[FC]	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	535,000	535,000
[N]	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	6,282,000	7,827,000
[MP]	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	2,649,000	2,649,000
[FC]	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,236,000	2,236,000
[FC]	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,396,000	1,396,000
[MP]	TOWN BLUFF DAM-STEINHAGEN LAKE-WILLIS HYDROPOWER, TX	1,167,000	1,167,000
[N]	TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	20,000	20,000
[FC]	WACO LAKE, TX	1,573,000	1,573,000
[FC]	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	402,000	402,000
[MP]	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	2,772,000	2,772,000
[FC]	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,734,000	1,734,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	VERMONT		
[FC]	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	394,000	394,000
[FC]	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	366,000	366,000
[FC]	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	357,000	357,000
[FC]	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	347,000	347,000
[FC]	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	330,000	330,000
	VIRGINIA		
[N]	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VIRGINIA	1,000,000	1,000,000
[N]	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	4,642,000	4,642,000
[N]	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	695,000	695,000
[N]	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	246,000	246,000
[N]	CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	129,000	129,000
[N]	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	734,000	734,000
[N]	CRANES CREEK, VA	181,000	181,000
[N]	DEEP CREEK, VA	715,000	715,000
[FC]	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,341,000	1,341,000
[N]	GREENVALE CREEK, LANCASTER COUNTY, VA	229,000	229,000
	HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR[DRIFT REMOVA	216,000	216,000
[N]	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	780,000	780,000
[MP]	JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	5,691,000	5,691,000
[FC]	JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,024,000	1,024,000
[N]	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	719,000	719,000
[N]	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	4,160,000	4,160,000
	NORFOLK HARBOR [PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS], V	520,000	520,000
[FC]	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	299,000	299,000
[N]	OYSTER CHANNEL, VA	328,000	328,000
[N]	PARKER CREEK, VA	274,000	274,000
[MP]	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	1,662,000	1,662,000
[N]	QUEENS CREEK, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	260,000	260,000
[N]	QUINBY CREEK, VA	366,000	366,000
[N]	STARLINGS CREEK, VA	360,000	360,000
[N]	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	427,000	427,000
[N]	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	1,405,000	1,405,000
[N]	TYLERS BEACH, VA	201,000	201,000
[N]	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,054,000	1,054,000
[N]	WINTER HARBOR, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	385,000	385,000
	WASHINGTON		
[N]	ANACORTES HARBOR, WA	12,000	12,000
[N]	BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	815,000	815,000
[MP]	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, RUFUS WOODS LAKE, WA	9,488,000	9,488,000
[N]	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	347,000	347,000
[N]	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND, WA	330,000	330,000
[N]	ELOCHOMAN SLOUGH, WA	106,000	106,000
[N]	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,027,000	1,027,000
[N]	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	2,493,000	2,493,000
[FC]	HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	750,000	750,000
[MP]	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,682,000	5,682,000
[N]	KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL, WA	7,000	7,000
[N]	LAKE CROCKETT [KEYSTONE HARBOR], WA	26,000	26,000
[N]	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,702,000	6,702,000
[MP]	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,553,000	3,553,000
[MP]	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,169,000	5,169,000
[MP]	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,306,000	4,306,000
[FC]	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	528,000	528,000
[FC]	MT. ST. HELEN SEDIMENT CONTROL STRUCTURE, WA	566,000	566,000
[FC]	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	5,710,000	5,710,000
[N]	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	20,000	20,000
[N]	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	707,000	707,000
[N]	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	487,000	487,000
[N]	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	397,000	397,000
[FC]	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	91,000	91,000
[N]	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	29,000	29,000
[FC]	TACOMA - PUYALLUP, WA	31,000	31,000
[N]	TACOMA HARBOR, WA	62,000	62,000
[MP]	THE DALLES LOCK & DAM - LAKE CELILO, WA	5,719,000	5,719,000
[N]	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	185,000	185,000
[FC]	WYNOOCHEE LAKE, WA	250,000	250,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
[FC]	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	689,000	689,000
[FC]	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	982,000	982,000
[FC]	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,015,000	1,015,000
	CHARLESTON RIVERFRONT PARK		350,000
[FC]	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,059,000	1,059,000
[N]	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	300,000	300,000
[FC]	ELKINS, WV	5,000	5,000
[N]	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,590,000	8,590,000
[FC]	R. D. BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,337,000	1,337,000
[FC]	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	872,000	872,000
[FC]	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,151,000	1,151,000
[FC]	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,325,000	1,325,000
[N]	TYGART LAKE, WV	915,000	915,000
	WISCONSIN		
[N]	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	542,000	542,000
[N]	CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI	124,000	124,000
[FC]	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI	485,000	485,000
[N]	FOX RIVER, WI	1,187,000	1,187,000
[N]	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,259,000	1,259,000
[N]	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI - DIKE DISPOSAL	807,000	807,000
[N]	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	138,000	138,000
[N]	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	317,000	317,000
[FC]	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	32,000	32,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
[N]	LA POINTE HARBOR, WI	92,000	92,000
[N]	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	360,000	360,000
[N]	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	2,395,000	2,395,000
[N]	OCONTO HARBOR, WI	363,000	363,000
[N]	PEPIN SMALL BOAT HARBOR, WI	8,000	8,000
[N]	PORT WING HARBOR, WI	135,000	135,000
[N]	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	486,000	486,000
[N]	STURGEON BAY, WI	699,000	699,000
	WYOMING		
[FC]	JACKSON HOLE, SNAKE RIVER, WY	787,000	787,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
[N]	DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM	7,200,000	7,200,000
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	6,671,000	6,671,000
	MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,850,000	1,850,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	8,000,000	8,000,000
	POLICY AND PROCEDURES OPTIONS FOR PROJECT O&M	1,000,000	---
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	9,904,000	9,904,000
	PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS (S	50,000	50,000
	RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE	800,000	800,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	1,000,000	1,000,000
[N]	REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REHABILITATION RE	4,000,000	2,000,000
	SCHEDULING OF FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	2,622,000	2,922,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	2,835,000	2,835,000
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	3,695,000	3,695,000
	WETLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAM	3,000,000	3,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE	-18,646,000	-17,646,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,389,500,000	1,450,669,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

[MP]	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
[FC]	FLOOD CONTROL
[BE]	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
[N]	NAVIGATION

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$13,221,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $13,221,000 for General Investigations instead of $12,926,000 as proposed by the House and $12,521,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $200,000 to continue advance planning for the Prairie Bend Unit, Nebraska. These funds will permit the Bureau of Reclamation to supplement the existing planning report/draft environmental impact statement to incorporate features of the project desired by local interests.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $642,897,000 for the Construction Program instead of $649,697,000 as proposed by the House and $641,027,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Both the House and Senate versions of the bill provided $250,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to begin a cost-shared feasibility study of water and power benefits to be derived at Auburn, California, from expanding a Corps of Engineers flood control dam. However, in response to communication with other Members of Congress, Committee members subsequently agreed to recommend that the Bureau of Reclamation proceed with a study of a complete multipurpose dam versus expansion of a pre-existing flood control dam, provided certain key requirements were squarely met and assurances to that effect were obtained from authoritative officials in the Administration.

These conditions were: that proceeding with the Bureau multipurpose study would not delay or hinder progress on the flood control project in any way; that the Bureau study comply fully with all principles and guidelines applicable to water resources projects for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act; and that these studies be completed in sufficient time to allow realistically for congressional authorization of flood protection by October of 1992.

On October 4, 1990, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Commissioner of Reclamation provided letters to Congress which did pledge to proceed with each study separately so that the Bureau study would not delay the Corps' study, which expressed the hope but not the certainty that the Bureau study could be completed in time for authorization by October of 1992, and which said that principles and guidelines would be followed in some but not all of the respects stipulated. Specifically, the letter from the OMB made no reference and no commitment at all to principles and guidelines governing feasibility reports and environmental compliance. The letter from the Commissioner of Reclamation said that principles and guidelines are necessary only for a document termed "a current economic analysis."

The Commissioner's letter said that compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act required only an "updating" of previous environmental documentation and that in view of a previous authorization for an Auburn project, the original feasibility study requires only updating also. It is not clear from the letter what standards the Commissioner intends such updating of environmental and feasibility documentation must meet, but the letter avoided applying full principles and guidelines to them.

In view of the controversy surrounding the multipurpose project, the serious threat to many thousands of people from floods in the American River watershed, the considerable changes in Auburn Dam's design since its original authorization and the probable reconfiguration of project benefits, it is the view of the conferees that the feasibility and environmental impact studies must be thorough and in accordance with the principles and guidelines which apply to such studies for any water resources project. Further, in accordance with the commitments received by Congress from the Office of Management and Budget and the Bureau of Reclamation, such study shall not delay the efforts of the Corps of Engineers to complete activities associated with "expandable" flood control only dam at Auburn.

The conference agreement includes an additional $3,500,000 for the Central Arizona Project (CAP) as proposed by the House. These funds are to be used to protect the Town of Marana against increased flood and erosion damages caused by a CAP siphon outlet and canal within the Santa Cruz River floodplain. In addition, this project would protect the siphon outlet and canal from overtopping and erosion during flood flows on the Santa Cruz River. The conferees direct the Bureau of Reclamation to enter into an intergovernmental agreement with the Pima County, Arizona Department of Transportation and Flood Control District to transfer these funds to the County for the purpose of conducting this necessary protection work. The cost of this protection work will be nonreimbursable.

The conferees urge the Bureau of Reclamation to reprogram funds to continue safety of dams modifications at Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam (Folsom Dam and related facilities).

Amendment No. 48: Provides that $185,768,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund as proposed by the House instead of $182,268,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

In fiscal year 1989, the Bureau of Reclamation began an effort to reduce the backlog of maintenance at its projects. The Congress has supported and continues to support that effort; however, due to the budgetary situation the conference agreement provides for a reduction of $10,000,000 below the budget request.

In the Bureau of Reclamation's operation and maintenance appropriation, costs of $2,800,000 are estimated for Kesterson Reservoir monitoring, research and office support activities. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to review the Department's repayment policies with respect to Kesterson and other drainage related costs with input from the Congress, state and local agencies, and the public and to submit a report on this policy, no later than March 31, 1991, to the appropriate Committees of the House and Senate. Recommendations on past and future cost allocations between Federal and non-Federal interests as well as recommendations on cost allocations between reimbursable and nonreimbursable functions shall be included in such report. No portion of Kesterson and other drainage related costs shall be recovered from non-Federal entities until a cost allocation formula has been established in accordance with this report. However, the appropriate non-Federal share of the $2,800,000 included in this appropriation shall be recovered by the conclusion of fiscal year 1991, pursuant to the recommended cost allocation formula.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 49: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 205. (a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the McGee Creek Authority, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, accepting a payment in an amount to be determined by the Secretary after appropriate investigation.

(b) CONTRACT TERMINATION.—Upon receipt of the payment specified in subsection (a), the McGee Creek Water Authority's obligation under contract between the Authority and the Secretary numbered 0-07-50-X0822, dated October 11, 1979, shall be terminated.

(c) TITLE TO PROJECT FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding any payments made by the McGee Creek Water Authority pursuant to section 205 (a) and (b) of this language or pursuant to any contract with the Secretary, title to project facilities of the McGee Creek Project, Oklahoma, shall remain with the United States.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement restores House language stricken by the Senate relating to repayment for the McGee Creek, Oklahoma, project amended to provide that the amount of repayment is to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

Sec. 206. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used to execute new long-term contracts for water supply from the Central Valley Project, California.

(b)(1) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into the following contracts: (A) a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the Sacramento County Water Agency, not to exceed 22,000 acre-feet annually, to meet the immediate needs of Sacramento County and a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the San Juan Suburban Water District, not to exceed 13,000 acre-feet annually, for diversion from Folsom Lake, with annual quantities delivered under these contracts to be determined by the Secretary based upon the quantity of water actually needed within the Sacramento County Water Agency service area and San Juan Suburban Water District after considering reasonable efforts to: (i) promote full utilization of existing water entitlements within Sacramento County, (ii) implement water conservation and metering programs within the areas served by the contract, and (iii) implement programs to maximize to the extent feasible conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater; and (B) a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the El Dorado County Water Agency, not to exceed 15,000 acre-feet annually, for diversion from Folsom Lake or for exchange upstream on the American River or its tributaries, considering reasonable efforts to implement water conservation programs within areas to be served by the contracts. The contracts required by this subsection are intended as the first phase of a contracting program to meet the long-term water supply needs of Sacramento and El Dorado Counties. The Secretary shall promptly initiate the necessary analysis for the long-term water supply contracts. The Secretary shall include in these contracts terms and conditions to ensure that the contracts may be amended in any respect required to meet the Secretary's obligations under applicable state law and the Federal environmental laws.

(2) Prior to entering into the contracts specified in subsection (b)(1) of this section, the Secretary is directed to comply with the provision of the National Environmental Policy Act by preparing joint Environmental Impact Statements and California Environmental Quality Act Environmental Impact Reports. The Sacramento County Water Agency shall be the joint lead agency with the Bureau of Reclamation in the preparation of the environmental documents required under (b)(1)(A) of this section and the El Dorado County Water Agency shall be the joint lead agency with the Bureau of Reclamation in the preparation of the environmental documents required under (b)(1)(B), with the Bureau of Reclamation cooperating in all aspects of the environmental review process, but not controlling that process.

(3) Diversions from the American River under the contract for the Sacramento County Water Agency shall, to the maximum extent rea-

sonable and feasible, take place at or near the mouth of the American River.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees note that the lower American River is a valuable resource which provides not only needed water supplies and significant flood control for Sacramento, but which also fosters numerous instream, public trust and wild and scenic river resources. As a consequence, diversions from the American River, to the maximum extent reasonable and feasible, should be undertaken at points at or near the mouth of the American River and upstream diversions should be subject to applicable flow requirements that may be established from time to time. For these reasons, the conferees believe that the Bureau of Reclamation's operation of facilities on the American River should protect these instream, public trust and wild and scenic river values to the maximum extent reasonable and feasible.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to pay, without reimbursement, $1,000,000 to the Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative as reimbursement for environmental protection requirements in connection with the development of hydroelectric power at the Island Park Dam and Reservoir, Idaho, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: "207"

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
	ARIZONA		
SP.INV.	UPPER SAN PEDRO RIVER OPTIMIZATION STUDY..............	75,000	75,000
	CALIFORNIA		
PROJ.INV.	AMERICAN RIVER FOLSOM SOUTH OPTIMIZATION STUDY........	50,000	50,000
	DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT................................	---	100,000
SP.INV.	INDIAN WELLS VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY............	175,000	175,000
	OFFSTREAM STORAGE INVESTIGATION.......................	---	150,000
	REFUGE WATER SUPPLY...................................	---	200,000
	SALINAS VALLEY WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.........	---	180,000
PROJ.INV.	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE	200,000	200,000
	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE.........................	---	50,000
SP.INV.	SANTA ANA WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STUDY..................	99,000	99,000
PROJ.INV.	SMALL PROJECT INTEGRATION WITH CVP....................	60,000	---
	COLORADO		
PROJ.INV.	UPPER GUNNISON-UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN PROJECT..............	280,000	280,000
	IDAHO		
SP.INV.	IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT........................	75,000	75,000
PROJ.INV.	MINIDOKA, NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIV. DRAINWTR MGMT STDY..	80,000	80,000
	KANSAS		
SP.INV.	ARKANSAS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY.....	240,000	240,000
	MONTANA		
SP.INV.	FLATHEAD RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.......	215,000	215,000
	TONGUE RIVER DAM, MT..................................	---	300,000
	NEBRASKA		
	LOUP RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGMENT STUDY................	---	75,000
	PRAIRIE BEND UNIT, P-SMBP.............................	---	200,000
	NEVADA		
PROJ.INV.	NORTHERN NEVADA WATER AUGMENTATION PROGRAM............	180,000	180,000
	NEW MEXICO		
SP.INV.	NEW MEXICO REGIONAL W*TER RESOURCES STUDY.............	200,000	200,000
	OKLAHOMA		
	NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY.................	---	150,000
	OREGON		
	GRAND RONDE BASIN WATER OPT. STUDY....................	---	220,000
PROJ.INV.	JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY...	200,000	200,000
PROJ.INV.	NORTHERN DOUGLAS CO. COOP. WATER RESOURCES STUDY......	50,000	50,000
PROJ.INV.	UPPER DESCHUTES RIVER BASIN WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT	290,000	290,000
PROJ.INV.	UPPER JOHN DAY WATER OPTIMIZATION PROJECT.............	250,000	250,000
PROJ.INV.	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.......	180,000	180,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
	BLACK HILLS HYDROLOGY STUDY...........................	---	100,000
	SOUTHEASTERN SOUTH DAKOTA PIPELINE....................	---	100,000
	TEXAS		
SP.INV.	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN TOTAL WATER MGMT STUDY.....	200,000	200,000
	UTAH		
SP.INV.	SEVIER RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY...................	120,000	120,000
SP.INV.	UTAH AREA WATER DEMAND MODEL..........................	100,000	100,000
	WASHINGTON		
PROJ.INV.	YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT..........	540,000	540,000
	WYOMING		
PROJ.INV.	WIND RIVER BASIN STUDY................................	37,000	37,000
	VARIOUS		
SP.INV.	COLORADO RIVER RECHARGE STUDY.........................	30,000	30,000
PROJ.INV.	COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM......	835,000	835,000
SP.INV.	DROUGHT INVESTIGATIONS................................	220,000	220,000
SP.INV.	ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	2,699,000	2,699,000
SP.INV.	FOUR CORNERS WATER ASSESSMENT.........................	150,000	150,000
SP.INV.	GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES..............................	875,000	875,000
SP.INV.	INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS....................	390,000	390,000
SP.INV.	MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS................	521,000	521,000
SP.INV.	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES........................	1,350,000	1,350,000
SP.INV.	TOXIC CONSTITUENT STUDIES.............................	265,000	265,000
SP.INV.	UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION..........	125,000	125,000
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.........................	11,456,000	13,221,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION - Continued

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		
	CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS	-	
	ARIZONA		
	HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT	8,872,000	8,872,000
	INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT (SAWRSA)	11,177,000	11,177,000
	CALIFORNIA		
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:		
	AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	1,500,000	1,750,000
	MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	2,400,000	2,600,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	3,866,000	3,866,000
	SAN FELIPE DIVISION	1,715,000	1,715,000
	SAN LUIS UNIT	2,911,000	2,911,000
	TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	7,362,000	7,362,000
	COLORADO		
	GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	14,732,000	14,732,000
	LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	4,726,000	4,726,000
	PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	3,380,000	3,380,000
	SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION	6,810,000	6,810,000
	NEBRASKA		
	NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP	21,648,000	21,648,000
	O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP	600,000	600,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
	GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	---	35,000,000
	OREGON		
	UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	---	7,052,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
	BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	8,024,000	8,024,000
	MNI WICONI RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	---	1,500,000
	WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	946,000	946,000
	WASHINGTON		
	COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:		
	IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,900,000	4,300,000
	THIRD POWERPLANT, GRAND COULEE DAM	3,348,000	5,348,000
	WYOMING		
	BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	11,930,000	11,930,000
	VARIOUS		
	BOULDER CANYON PROJECT	23,920,000	23,920,000
	MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	14,295,000	14,295,000
	SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION	158,059,000	204,461,000
	DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:		
	ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	---	500,000
	BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	1,980,000	1,980,000
	BRANTLEY PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	500,000	500,000
	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT, WA	739,000	739,000
	COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR, CO	6,300,000	6,300,000
	CULTURAL RESOURCES ACT., ID,ND,NE,MT,ORE,SD,WA,WY	75,000	75,000
	FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO	1,470,000	1,470,000
	GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA	368,000	368,000
	KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	1,186,000	1,186,000
	LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	3,360,000	3,360,000
	MCGEE CREEK, PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	500,000	500,000
	MINIDOKA PROJECT	702,000	702,000
	NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	950,000	950,000
	PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:		
	EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	50,000	50,000
	FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	460,000	730,000
	OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	65,000	65,000
	OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	15,000	15,000
	RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESERVOIRS, VARIOUS	315,000	315,000
	VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NM	---	500,000
	WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	305,000	305,000
	WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	2,000,000	2,000,000
	YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE AND PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WASH.	3,900,000	3,900,000
	SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION	25,240,000	26,510,000
	SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:		
	BIA - DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	9,055,000	---
	BOISE PROJECT, DEER FLAT DAM, IDAHO	17,225,000	17,225,000
	CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA	280,000	280,000
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, SAN LUIS UN., O'NEILL DAM, CA	1,980,000	1,980,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	650,000	650,000
	HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH	1,350,000	1,350,000
	INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	16,725,000	16,725,000
	MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING	409,000	409,000
	MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	2,550,000	2,550,000
	SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, ARIZONA	2,550,000	2,550,000
	SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, ARIZONA	850,000	850,000
	SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA	3,394,000	3,394,000
	SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	5,130,000	5,130,000
	W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA	5,200,000	5,200,000
	SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS	67,348,000	58,293,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION - Continued

REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:		
BOSTWICK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NE	---	150,000
HIGHLAND-HANOVER DIVISION, P-SMBP, WY	150,000	150,000
HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH	786,000	786,000
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MT	410,000	410,000
MILK RIVER, MALTA DIVISION, MT	560,000	560,000
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UTAH	1,954,000	1,954,000
SARGENT IRRIGATION DISTRICT, P-SMBP, NE	---	200,000
UPPER BLUFF DIVISION, P-SMBP, WY	110,000	110,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	2,200,000	2,200,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT	6,170,000	6,520,000
PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY:		
COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE CROSSING	1,000,000	1,000,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:		
GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE	2,400,000	2,400,000
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	4,503,000	4,503,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	6,400,000	6,400,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	13,303,000	13,303,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS	271,120,000	310,087,000

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND

PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

COLORADO		
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	13,415,000	13,415,000
DOLORES PROJECT	49,050,000	49,050,000
UTAH		
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	81,773,000	81,773,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT	50,000	50,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:		
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT, UTAH	30,000	30,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT, COLORADO	745,000	745,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:		
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	11,836,000	11,836,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	15,132,000	15,132,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT	172,031,000	172,031,000

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

ARIZONA		
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)	182,268,000	185,768,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS	1,996,000	1,996,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-SAFETY OF DAMS	14,202,000	14,202,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT	198,466,000	201,966,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS		
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	-32,187,000	-41,187,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	609,430,000	642,897,000

LOAN PROGRAM

MONTANA		
MIDDLE CREEK DAM REHABILITATION PROJECT	2,944,000	2,944,000
TEXAS		
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 1 SUPPL	2,002,000	2,002,000
VARIOUS		
ADMINISTRATION OF THE LOAN PROGRAM	762,000	762,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM	5,708,000	5,708,000

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

OVERHEAD TAXES

The conferees are concerned about the Department of Energy's increased use of overhead taxes and indirect charges which reduce funds available for specific energy, science, and national security programs approved by the Congress. Currently, overhead taxes are being applied for purposes such as independent research and development; occupational safety and health activities; environmental remediation; science, math and education programs; and technology transfer. It is not possible to determine the exact amount of these indirect charges from the Department's existing budget justifications. The conferees direct the Department to submit as part of the FY 1992 budget a description of all overhead taxes or indirect charges which will be made against direct programs during the year, the total amount of the tax, the percentage applied to the direct program, and a justification for each program funded by indirect charges or overhead taxes.

EPA REIMBURSEMENT

The conferees note that there have been proposals which would direct the Secretary of Energy to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for costs necessary to ensure oversight by EPA of environmental response actions at Department of Energy (DOE) facilities.

Funding for defense activities in the FY 1991 budget must be used to maintain the national security as well as begin to address environmental restoration and cleanup activities at DOE facilities across the nation. To permit an open-ended reimbursement policy by the EPA could severely hamper other important national security activities. In addition, these proposals would permit EPA to augment the funds provided through the Congressional appropriations process for specific EPA functions. EPA could arbitrarily increase spending for personnel and initiate programs with little or no oversight by cognizant Congressional Committees.

Permitting a policy of reimbursement of the EPA for performing its mandated oversight functions does not save money. This approach merely buries the cost of EPA oversight in myriad government programs, makes it difficult to track the actual cost of environmental cleanup activities, and complicates Congressional oversight of EPA programs and personnel. The conferees expect EPA to request adequate resources during the appropriations process to fully fund personnel and programs needed to carry out its mission.

INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The conferees are concerned about the Department's management of the laboratory-directed research and development program and the lack of uniformity in the policy applied at various Departmental laboratories. The Department is directed to develop a policy which will improve the oversight and accountability of this program and ensure that the guidelines are followed consistently by each laboratory. The Secretary of Energy is to provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations his procedures for implementing these recommendations.

Additionally, the Department's FY 1992 budget and future budget submissions should identify the amount of independent research and development funds, the location of the funds, and a justification of the funding.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$2,527,082,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $2,527,082,000 for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities instead of $2,745,615,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,703,272,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following: *$89,842,500 shall be available only for the following facilities: Advanced Technology Center, Indiana State University; Center for Energy Resources Management, University of New Orleans; Biomedical Research Facility, University of Alabama at Birmingham; Biomedical Research Facility, Case Western Reserve University; Energy Science Research Facility at Boston College; Center for Nuclear Medicine Research in Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders, Health Sciences Center, West Virginia University; Gazes Cardiac Research Institute, Medical University of South Carolina; Biomedical Research Institute, Louisiana State University Medical Center, Shreveport, Louisiana; the Neurosensory Research Center, Oregon Health Sciences University; and the Physical Sciences Center, Fort Hays State University, Fort Hays, Kansas*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate earmarking funds for the Hydrogen Energy Systems Program. In addition, the conference agreement restores language proposed by the House and amended by the Senate providing funds for specified projects.

Amendment No. 54: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated herein, $5,500,000 shall be available only for the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy research program at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory and $7,500,000 shall be available only for the modification and operation of the Power Burst Facility at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, and the Secretary of Energy is directed to obligate and expend funds for those activites prior to the end of the fiscal year 1991*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the specific funding of the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy research program.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The conferees provide $2,000,000 for a utility/industry power project using monolithic amorphous silicon-photovoltaic modules and $300,000 is included to assist industry in the integration of SERI tested thin film modules into the design and construction of grid-connected buildings as proposed by the House. Funds are not included to continue the Southeast and Southwest regional experiment stations.

Biofuels energy systems.—The conferees provide $4,500,000 for short rotation woody crops as proposed by the House and $4,500,000 for the regional biofuels program as proposed by the Senate.

Wind energy systems.—The conferees provide that from the total funds available for wind energy research, $1,500,000 is to be made available for the Renewable Energy Research Center program at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Ocean energy systems. —Under the Ocean Energy account, the conferees have provided $2,750,000 for the PICHTR-OTEC project. Not less than $2,250,000 of the PICHTR-OTEC funds shall be made available directly to the organization established by the State of Hawaii pursuant to section 3 of Act 152 of the 1983 Hawaii Legislative Session.

Geothermal.—The conferees provide for the projects as described in the House and Senate reports except that funding for the Fenton Hill project is limited to the budget and $1,500,000 shall be available for the Department to cooperate with industry efforts to maintain production at The Geysers geothermal field.

The conferees agree to provide $5,000,000 to continue the Hawaii geothermal resource verification and characterization project as described in the Senate report.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The conferees provide for the projects as described by the House and Senate reports except that $2,500,000 is included for the thermal energy storage research program. This latter effort includes both diurnal and industrial thermal energy storage and seasonal energy storage to help ensure that research and development support for U.S. firms will maintain international competitiveness in this important energy storage program.

Any reductions that are made to the Electric Energy Systems account as a result of congressional action are to be applied in such a manner so as to not disproportionally reduce the funding for the high temperature superconducting pilot centers at Argonne, Los Alamos and Oak Ridge National Laboratories.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The conferees direct the Secretary of Energy to develop a plan to implement the cooperative research, development and demonstration project of spent Nuclear Fuel Dual Purpose (Storage and Transportation) Casks described in House Report 101-536 under Nuclear Energy Programs.

Such plan, which shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than March 31, 1991, shall include a recommendation to ensure the full Federal funding of the project in fiscal years 1992 and 1993.

The conferees provide for an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request for the Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) in Idaho for the integral fast reactor program. An additional $3,000,000 is included for the Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor program.

The conferees have included $33,500,000 for the space and defense power systems. Budget constraints continue to require that other departments and agencies come up with their fair share of the costs of these activities.

The conferees agree with the Senate report concerning groundwater contamination at the Falls City, Texas, site.

The conferees provide $7,000,000 of the amended request to permit the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations to evaluate the safety of civilian reactors in the Soviet Union.

The conferees provide $6,000,000 of the amended request to provide for the Office of Nuclear Safety.

SAFETY AND HEALTH

The conferees provide $7,000,000 of the amended request to fund the Office of Health and study air pollution in Mexico City.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The conferees provide for activities as described in the House and Senate reports with the following exceptions.

The conferees provide $65,900,000 for Global Warming Research, including $9,000,000 for the National Institute of Global Environmental Change.

The conferees provide for a total of $22,200,000 for the energy biosciences program through competitive grants under Supporting Research and Technical Analysis as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that project 87-R-130, Institute of Nuclear Medicine, New Jersey, may proceed with construction in New Jersey at or near the Newark campus of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey provided that the facility will be available for cooperative research with federal laboratories such as DOE, university clinical and laboratory researchers, including the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, and local and community hospitals.

The conferees recommend that the Department of Energy solicit competitive proposals to fund up to seven hospital-based, multi-disciplinary medical university demonstration projects and establish them as Centers of Excellence for Laser Medical Applications. Funds to provide for up to $750,000 to each Center for planning and development costs have been provided, with total funding not to exceed $1,500,000, and the conferees expect a report no later than 120 days following enactment of the Act detailing funding plans, and overview of a program to carry out the use of this very hopeful, innovative and cost-effective technology.

The conferees are cognizant of a National Biomedical Tracer Facility (NBTF) Planning Study which is to be completed by the U.S. Department of Energy in cooperation with the nuclear medicine community. The Secretary of Energy is to report the findings of the NBTF Planning Study to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The conferees note recent scientific progress in the fusion program. The Department of Energy is conducting an extensive review of the scope and direction of the Magnetic Fusion program. This review is scheduled for completion this fall.

Because of severe budget constraints, the conferees agree to provide $275,300,000 for the fusion program. In order to provide the Department with the flexibility to develop a meaningful program, the conferees are recommending that these funds be provided without further allocation between program components, projects, and activities within the fusion program.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The conferees provide for activities as described in the House and Senate reports with the following exceptions.

The conferees provide that from within the Department's expanding education programs not less than $2,000,000 shall be available for EPSCoR planning grants and $2,000,000 for Graduate Traineeship EPSCoR funding.

The conferees provide $5,000,000 to be made available, on a competitive basis, to university nuclear engineering programs. These monies are to be made available for graduate fellowships, direct research support, and educational support programs in the field of nuclear engineering.

The conferees provide $22,200,000 through competitive grants for the energy biosciences program.

Within available funds of the Department of Energy, $200,000 shall be made available for Rural Enterprises, Inc., a tax-exempt, non-profit technology transfer center in Oklahoma, to continue a technology transfer demonstration project for the Department of Energy that will attempt to draw prime candidates for transfer to other private and public sector entities, put a system in place for drawing upon these resources, and transfer DOE technologies to private and public sector entities.

From within funds made available in applied mathematical sciences, basic energy sciences, and other energy programs in this account not otherwise discussed in this report, an amount equal to the fiscal year 1990 amount is to be made available to continue the cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and the Supercomputer Computations Research Institute (SCRI) located at Florida State University. However, if deemed beneficial for the program, the DOE and FSU may mutually agree to adjust the support to be made available to not less than 83% of the FY 1990 amount. DOE and FSU shall work toward normalizing the SCRI support within the DOE budget. The conferees continue to be impressed by the contributions of SCRI to high performance computing in the U.S.

The conferees continue to support the construction of the 6–7 GeV Synchrotron Radiation Source at the Argonne National Laboratory. However, because of severe budget constraints the conferees have reduced the requested increase in funding, providing a total funding of $70,000,000 in FY 1991.

The conferees agree that the Department of Energy may utilize the funds provided in fiscal year 1990 for the operation of the Advanced Technology Research Center at Oklahoma State University, which can be matched by local and private funds, for the construction of such Center.

The conferees have not made any specific allocation of funds for x-ray lithography.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The conferees have provided a reduction of $50,000,000 to the Energy Supply, Research and Development program for non-defense education programs. The Department has a laroing and of ongoing and new initiatives dealing with scientific and energy related education programs. The conferees are supportive of these programs and note that these education programs support the Department's defense mission equally with its other scientific programs. Accordingly, the conferees have provided $50,000,000 to fund education programs in the Atomic Energy Defense Activities appropriation consistent with proposals contained in the authorizing legislation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (NON-DEFENSE)

The conferees strongly support the Department's efforts to deal with the environment and waste problems at its facilities. However, because of budget restrictions, the conferees have reduced the increase in funding for this program by $50,000,000. This reduction is accomplished by increasing the Department's account for unidentified slippage in programs.

The conferees have included $84,000,000 for the operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), endorse the establishment of the FFTF as a user complex, and encourage the Department to enter into long-term agreements with non-Federal entities (including foreign governments and entities, and municipalities) to use the facility for commercial research as well as isotope and steam production. The agreements should be consistent with DOE contracting practices and allow for the Department to charge for the use of the facility. The Department should cooperate with the State of Washington to thoroughly assess the domestic and foreign commercial market potential for services and products which FFTF can provide and to identify options for providing such services. The conferees direct that the Department spend sufficient funds within the FY 1991 FFTF operating monies for the purpose of exploring marketing opportunities.

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $1,340,018,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,406,018,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates revenues of $1,450,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,530,500,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees note that appropriations for uranium enrichment are intended to include costs necessary for transfer of technology for alternate applications.

The conferees agree with the funding for Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities as provided by the Senate which reflects the amendments to the budget submitted by the Administration.

The conferees direct the Department of Energy to reprogram/transfer funds for Nuclear Energy Research and Development and facility cleanup as requested in letters to the committees dated April 30, 1990, and May 31, 1990.

GENERAL SCIENCE

Because of severe budget restraints, the conferees agree to a $50,000,000 reduction to the General Science appropriation, excluding the superconducting super collider, as may be determined by the Secretary.

The conferees agree with the Department's proposed allocation to initiate fabrication of the Gammasphere facility and take note of the proposed siting of the Gammasphere at the Holifield heavy-ion accelerator at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The conferees expect that the Department shall maintain the operation of each of the three heavy-ion accelerators at the national laboratories (Atlas at Argonne National Laboratory, the 88-inch Cyclotron at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and the Holifield) with funds allocated in the Nuclear Physics budget.

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

Because of severe budget restraints, the conferees agree to a $75,000,000 reduction to the Superconducting Super Collider. The conferees recognize the critical importance of the SSC for the Nation and for advancing knowledge in the key area of high energy physics.

The conferees agree to remove the restriction on $25,000,000 in construction funds that was imposed in the reports on the FY 1990 appropriation.

In order to keep the program on schedule, and to assure that reductions in appropriated amounts do not result in an increase in the overall cost of the project, conferees encourage the State of

Texas to make available in FY 1991 sufficient amounts to meet the anticipated program requirements during FY 1991.

The SSC is crucial to maintaining U.S. scientific leadership. However, the conferees have a number of concerns that have yet to be addressed by the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy has yet to provide, as promised, an updated estimate of the total cost of the SSC. The Department is encouraged to complete the cost estimate immediately. Also of continued concern is the Department's progress in securing firm foreign commitments to the SSC. While the conferees are aware that contributions of this nature take significant time to develop, the Department is encouraged to accelerate the process.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Amendment No. 57: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $242,833,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. To the extent that balances in the fund are not sufficient to cover amounts available for obligation in the account, the Secretary shall exercise his authority pursuant to section 302(e)(5) of said Act to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury: Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated, within available funds, not to exceed $4,146,000, may be provided to the State of Nevada, for the conduct of its oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97-425, as amended, $622,000 is to be available for the University of Nevada, Reno for infrastructure studies related to nuclear waste, and $207,000 is to be available to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to carry out transportation studies related to nuclear waste: Provided further, That not more than $4,892,000, may be provided to affected local governments, as defined in the Act, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for any lobbying activity as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used for litigation expenses: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated herein, up to $4,146,000 shall be available for infrastructure studies and other research and development work to be carried out by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) and the University of Nevada, Reno.

In paying the amounts determined to be appropriate as a result of the decision in Consolidated Edison Company of New York v. Department of Energy, 870 F.2d 694 (D.C. Cir. 1989), the Department of Energy shall pay interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury and calculated from the date the amounts were de-

posited into the Nuclear Waste Fund. Such payments may be made by credits to future utility payments into the fund.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $242,833,000 for nuclear waste disposal activities and provides certain direction with regard to the implementation of the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 58: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$10,914,014,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $10,914,014,000 for Atomic Energy Defense Activities instead of $10,915,148,000 as proposed by the House and $10,980,258,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that accomplishing R&D in the weapons program outside the National Laboratories creates problems because of the highly classified nature of the program. The conferees understand that the Rochester Institute of Technology is a high caliber institution conducting work in microelectronic engineering and imaging sciences. The Department is urged to consider use of this facility in accomplishing this type of work in the weapons program.

Pending a review of the 5-year budget plan to be submitted by the Secretary of Energy detailing long-term plans for funding programs and projects of the national security programs for the Department of Energy, the conferees agree to defer without prejudice funding for Project 88–D–105, the Special Nuclear Materials R&D Laboratory Replacement.

The Senate report contains language concerning the use of funds for the acquisition of a supercomputer subject to approval by the Secretary of Energy and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate. The House bill or report did not address this matter. In lieu of the Senate report language, the conferees agree that any supercomputer procured by the Department of Energy through the expenditure of funds appropriated by this Act shall be procured in a competitive and nondiscriminatory manner, as required by the Competition in Contracting Act, and as provided in the recently concluded U.S.-Japan Trade Agreement regarding government procurement of supercomputers.

The conferees agree to provide the budget request of $4,980,000 for the Marshall Islands radiological activities.

The conferees agree to provide within available funds for the Inertial Confinement Fusion program, $8,500,000 to upgrade the OMEGA laser at the University of Rochester, $10,000,000 to upgrade the NOVA laser at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and note that the Naval Research Laboratory program is to be funded at the level included in the budget request. Also, the request of $10,000,000 for target development, production, and delivery is included as proposed in the budget.

The conferees agree with the House report language regarding the report requirement for the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program. The Department of Energy should ensure that the report will be a useful document clearly outlining performance versus planned milestones for the program.

Consistent with direction provided by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees during deliberations on the FY 1991 National Defense Authorization Act, the conferees have deleted funds for the following activities: Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons Capital Equipment, $11,250,000; Project 88-D-106, Nuclear Directed Energy Research Facility, $5,000,000; and Project 89-D-125, Plutonium Recovery Modification Project, $65,000,000.

The conferees agree that the Department's Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons (NDEW) program is an integral part of the activities performed in the core research and development weapons program. Accordingly, $90,654,000 associated with NDEW has been provided as part of research and development operating expenses.

The conference agreement provides that all funding for the program direction and management functions for the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program be included as part of the defense function. The Department had proposed this as part of the non-defense environmental restoration program, but since more than 80 percent of the program is funded within the Atomic Energy Defense Activities account, the conferees chose to realign the program direction activity with the majority of the funds.

The conference agreement moves $50,000,000 of science, mathematics, and engineering education programs to the Atomic Energy Defense Activities account from the Energy Supply, Research and Development account. This program will ensure that technical and scientific workers are available in the future to accomplish the national security mission of the Department.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *, except for $15,000,000 in operating expenses for nonsite specific design activities and activities in support of ongoing preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement, subject to authorization: Provided further, That no funds in this Act shall be available for Project 89-D-125, Plutonium Recovery Modification Project (PRMP), until authorizing legislation therefore is enacted into law*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides that $15,000,000 in operating expenses may be used for nonsite specific design activities and activities in support of ongoing preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for a plutonium processing facility.

Amendment No. 60: Deletes language proposed by the Senate that earmarked specific funding for the verification and control technology program, deleted funding for the Nuclear Depth/Strike

Bomb, and limited funding for production and surveillance operating expenses and weapons testing program operating expenses.

Amendment No. 61: Deletes language proposed by the Senate that transferred $500,000 to the Tennessee Valley Authority for environmental monitoring activities.

The conferees agree that not to exceed $500,000 of the amount appropriated for environmental restoration and waste management may be transferred to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to assist the Department of Energy (DOE) in assessing and monitoring areas and activities within or adjacent to Watts Bar Reservoir, Tennessee, which may be adversely affected by radioactive, mercury, or other contaminants resulting from runoff from DOE facilities within the State of Tennessee. The TVA and DOE should determine the scope of assessment and monitoring activities to be undertaken, and TVA shall make available to the DOE, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the State of Tennessee, all findings and information related to such activities. TVA should request funding as part of its FY 1992 budget request if it seeks to continue this activity in the future.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conferees agree to provide an additional increment of $326,900,000 in new borrowing authority for system development and maintenance, energy conservation, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment. Of this amount, $136,600,000 is available only for the Third Alternating Current Intertie. This amount will fully fund the proposed Third A.C. Intertie requirements in FY 1991. The conferees deleted proposed borrowing authority of $32,600,000 for other capital investments and $15,800,000 for maintenance/replacement work as provided by the Senate.

The conferees are very concerned that the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is continuing to request Federal borrowing authority for all capital needs. Compared to other large utilities, BPA has a high proportion of debt to assets. Continued Federal borrowing has mortgaged BPA's future—the conferees expect BPA to present a realistic budget for FY 1992 which limits the use of Federal borrowing and finances a significant portion of capital additions with revenues.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conferees note with approval that the investor-owned utilities are seeking the necessary approval of the California Public Utilities Commission to participate in the Harold T. "Bizz" Johnson California-Pacific Intertie Transmission Line, also known as the California-Oregon Transmission Project, and urge the expenditious completion of this process. Should the investor-owned utilities fail to provide the required transmission services, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration should develop plans to submit to Congress to provide such facilities that the participants determine are necessary.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which involves procurements by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Amendment No. 63: Deletes House language stricken by the Senate directing the Secretary of Energy to use the Corps of Engineers to manage the environmental restoration of the Hanford Site in Richland, Washington.

Amendment No. 64: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to delete the matter proposed by the Senate amendment and on page 3, line 13, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "30,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "27,200,000"; and on page 14, line 22, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "136,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "136,100,000, of which $9,500,000 shall be derived from funds appropriated to "General expenses" by Public Law 101-302"; and on page 21, line 8, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "231,516,000" and insert in lieu thereof "221,516,000"; and on page 33, line 13, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "1,273,732,000" and insert in lieu thereof "1,148,732,000"; and on page 35, line 20, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "375,095,000" and insert in lieu thereof "365,095,000"; and on page 36, line 12, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "225,095,000" and insert in lieu thereof "215,095,000"; and on page 46, line 13, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "471,320,000" and insert in lieu thereof "461,320,000"; and on page 47, line 6, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "156,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "153,450,000"; and on page 47, line 20, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 5019, strike "314,570,000" and insert in lieu thereof "307,870,000".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees have had to make reductions and other adjustments as a result of the conference report on the Budget Resolution which mandated reductions in the programs funded in this bill. This amendment also deletes Senate language providing a limitation on the use of funds for laboratory-directed research and development.

Amendment No. 65: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate regarding the use of appropriated funds to carry out programs to improve mathematics, science and engineering education and skill levels in the United States.

Amendment No. 66: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate regarding the evaluation of a supercomputing facility.

Department of Energy

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
SOLAR ENERGY		
I. Solar applications		
A. Solar building energy systems		
Operating expenses	1,000,000	2,000,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems		
Operating expenses	42,800,000	46,100,000
Capital equipment	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	43,600,000	46,900,000
C. Solar thermal energy systems		
Operating expenses	19,350,000	19,350,000
Capital equipment	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	19,500,000	19,500,000
D. Biofuels energy systems		
Operating expenses	27,000,000	32,550,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	28,000,000	33,550,000
E. Wind energy systems		
Operating expenses	8,400,000	11,000,000
Capital equipment	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	8,600,000	11,200,000
F. Ocean energy systems		
Operating expenses	---	2,750,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	100,700,000	115,900,000
II. Other solar energy		
A. International solar energy program - OE	1,500,000	1,500,000
B. Solar technology transfer		
Operating expenses	2,223,000	2,223,000
C. Solar Energy Research Institute		
Capital equipment	410,000	410,000
Construction:		
General plant projects	290,000	290,000
91-E-100 Solar energy research facility SERF.	4,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	4,790,000	4,790,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute	5,200,000	5,200,000
D. Resource assessment		
Operating expenses	950,000	950,000
Capital equipment	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, Resource assessment	1,000,000	1,000,000
E. Program support - OE	900,000	900,000
F. Program direction - OE	4,350,000	4,350,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy	15,173,000	15,173,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	115,873,000	131,073,000
(Operating expenses)	(108,473,000)	(123,673,000)
(Capital equipment)	(2,610,000)	(2,610,000)
(Construction)	(4,790,000)	(4,790,000)

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
GEOTHERMAL		
I. Geopressured research		
Operating expenses	2,900,000	6,000,000
II. Geothermal technology development		
Operating expenses	13,795,000	20,295,000
Capital equipment	405,000	405,000
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	14,200,000	20,700,000
III. Program direction - OE	900,000	900,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	18,000,000	27,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(17,595,000)	(27,195,000)
(Capital equipment)	(405,000)	(405,000)
HYDROPOWER		
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	920,000	920,000
II. Program direction - OE	80,000	80,000
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER	1,000,000	1,000,000
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE		
I. Electric energy systems		
A. Electric field effects research		
Operating expenses	2,500,000	3,500,000
B. Reliability research		
Operating expenses	1,572,000	1,572,000
C. System and materials research		
Operating expenses	21,761,000	21,761,000
Capital equipment	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, System and materials research	22,661,000	22,661,000
D. Program direction - OE	614,000	614,000
Subtotal,Electric energy systems	27,347,000	28,347,000
II. Energy Storage Systems		
A. Battery storage		
Operating expenses	11,189,000	9,189,000
Capital equipment	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Battery storage	11,489,000	9,489,000
B. Thermal and chemical storage		
Operating expenses	1,000,000	3,000,000
C. Program direction - OE	417,000	417,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	12,906,000	12,906,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	40,253,000	41,253,000
(Operating expenses)	(39,053,000)	(40,053,000)
(Capital equipment)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)
NUCLEAR		
I. Nuclear energy R & D		
A. Light water reactor		
Operating expenses	41,500,000	38,500,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
B. Advanced reactor R & D		
Operating expenses	45,000,000	55,000,000
Capital equipment	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	47,000,000	57,000,000
C. Space & defense power systems		
Operating expenses	38,040,000	22,040,000
Capital equipment	2,160,000	2,160,000
Construction:		
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	14,300,000	9,300,000
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	54,500,000	33,500,000
D. Advanced nuclear systems		
Operating expenses	55,500,000	55,500,000
Capital equipment	6,400,000	6,400,000
Construction:		
89-N-111 RPSF	13,600,000	13,600,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	75,500,000	75,500,000
E. Facilities		
Operating expenses	131,078,000	83,078,000
Capital equipment	2,300,000	2,300,000
Construction:		
91-E-201 Modification to reactors	2,200,000	2,200,000
GPN-102 GPP	3,012,000	3,012,000
89-N-115 Fire suf. imp., ANL	1,900,000	1,900,000
Subtotal, Construction	4,912,000	4,912,000
Subtotal, Facilities	140,490,000	92,490,000
F. Program direction - OE	8,800,000	8,800,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy R & D	367,790,000	305,790,000
(Operating expenses)	(319,918,000)	(262,918,000)
(Capital equipment)	(12,860,000)	(12,860,000)
(Construction)	(35,012,000)	(30,012,000)
III. Civilian waste R & D		
A. Spent fuel storage R & D		
Operating expenses	590,000	590,000
B. Program direction	110,000	110,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R & D	700,000	700,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	368,490,000	306,490,000
(Operating expenses)	(320,618,000)	(263,618,000)
(Capital equipment)	(12,860,000)	(12,860,000)
(Construction)	(35,012,000)	(30,012,000)
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY		
I. Nuclear Safety		
Operating expenses	8,000,000	5,000,000
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
I. Environment, safety and health		
Operating expenses	104,879,000	102,879,000
Capital equipment	1,542,000	1,542,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	106,421,000	104,421,000
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY		
I. Spill test facility		
Operating expenses	1,085,000	1,085,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH		
I. Biological and environmental research		
Operating expenses	317,888,000	375,488,000
Capital equipment	11,621,000	11,621,000
Construction:		
GP-E-120 General plant projects	3,485,000	3,485,000
II. Program direction	5,800,000	5,800,000
TOTAL, BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	338,794,000	396,394,000
(Operating expenses)	(323,688,000)	(381,288,000)
(Capital equipment)	(11,621,000)	(11,621,000)
(Construction)	(3,485,000)	(3,485,000)
FUSION		
I. Magnetic fusion		
A. Confinement systems	163,050,000	163,050,000
B. Development and technology	48,060,000	48,060,000
C. Applied plasma physics	70,880,000	70,880,000
D. Planning and projects	4,250,000	4,250,000
E. Program direction - OE	5,650,000	5,650,000
F. Capital equipment	14,310,000	14,310,000
G. Construction		
GPP-900 General plant projects	8,000,000	8,000,000
89-R-800 Confinement physics res facility	11,100,000	11,100,000
Subtotal, Construction	19,100,000	19,100,000
General reduction	---	-50,000,000
TOTAL, FUSION	325,300,000	275,300,000
(Operating expenses)	(291,890,000)	(241,890,000)
(Capital equipment)	(14,310,000)	(14,310,000)
(Construction)	(19,100,000)	(19,100,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS		
I. Basic energy sciences		
A. Materials sciences	221,954,000	276,547,000
B. Chemical sciences	150,500,000	158,500,000
C. Applied mathematical sciences	47,975,000	52,975,000
D. Engineering and geosciences	32,500,000	34,500,000
E. Advanced energy projects	24,000,000	25,000,000
F. Energy biosciences	20,200,000	22,200,000
G. Program direction - OE	6,500,000	6,500,000
H. Capital equipment	37,019,000	37,019,000
I. Construction		
91-E-314 AID	6,965,000	6,965,000
GPE-400 General plant projects	3,069,000	3,069,000
89-R-402 6-7 GeV Syn. Radiation Source	75,000,000	70,000,000
87-R-406 1-2 GeV Synch Rad Sc, LBL	23,000,000	23,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	108,034,000	103,034,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	648,682,000	716,275,000
(Operating expenses)	(503,629,000)	(576,222,000)
(Capital equipment)	(37,019,000)	(37,019,000)
(Construction)	(108,034,000)	(103,034,000)

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
II. Energy oversight, research analy. and Univ support		
A. Energy research analysis - OE..................	3,683,000	3,683,000
B. University research support - OE		
Operating expenses:		
1. University reactor fuel assistance........	2,230,000	2,230,000
2. Laboratory Coop Science Education Ctrs....	23,230,000	35,230,000
3. University program........................	1,900,000	1,900,000
4. R & D laboratory tech transfer............	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, University research support............	29,760,000	41,760,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE...................	4,250,000	4,250,000
D. University research instrumentation............	4,924,000	4,924,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, and Univ sup...	42,[illegible]17,000	54,617,000
III. Multiprogram energy laboratories - facility sup		
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities		
Construction:		
91-E-300 Building 90 Science Rehab, LBL.....	3,700,000	3,700,000
90-R-100 Trans. Fac. Replacement, ANL.......	1,400,000	1,400,000
90-R-121 Rehab fire, water, pumping and storage systems, ANL........................	1,000,000	1,000,000
90-R-107 Boiler Replacement, BNL...........	3,201,000	3,201,000
90-R-108 Ctrl. Shops Alteration & Add., BNL.	1,374,000	1,374,000
90-R-109 Building Addition, BNL.............	24,000	24,000
90-R-112 Measurements and Controls Support Facility, ORNL.....................	3,100,000	3,100,000
90-R-113 Elec. Syst. Upgrade, ORNL..........	1,457,000	1,457,000
90-R-117 Slope/Seismic Stabilization, LBL...	2,415,000	2,415,000
90-R-118 Fire Protection Upgrade, ORNL......	1,979,000	1,979,000
89-R-102 Fire Protection III, BNL...........	33,000	33,000
89-R-108 roads and parking rehab., ORNL.....	12,000	12,000
89-R-112 Replace PCB Transformers, ANL......	7,000	7,000
88-R-805 Environmental improvements, BNL....	18,000	18,000
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project, LBL..............................	1,574,000	1,574,000
88-R-807 Electrical system rehab, ANL.......	898,000	898,000
87-R-753 Rehabilitate Laboratory Space (Building 200), ANL.........................	1,537,000	1,537,000
87-R-756 Waterline Replacement, ANL.........	8,000	8,000
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)...	6,000	6,000
Subtotal, Multiprogram general purpose facilities	23,743,000	23,743,000
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy laboratories - fac sup..	23,743,000	23,743,000
(Construction)...................................	(23,743,000)	(23,743,000)
TOTAL, SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS.....	715,042,000	794,635,000
(Operating expenses).................................	(546,246,000)	(630,839,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(37,019,000)	(37,019,000)
(Construction)......................................	(131,777,000)	(126,777,000)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT		
I. Policy and management		
A. Policy and management - ER......................	850,000	850,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
B. Policy and management - NE	32,921,000	32,921,000
C. Policy and management - CE	1,668,000	1,668,000
TOTAL, POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	35,439,000	35,439,000
ENERGY APPLICATIONS		
I. Technical information management program		
Operating expenses	14,100,000	14,100,000
Capital equipment	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, Technical information management program	15,000,000	15,000,000
II. In-house energy management		
Operating expenses	3,540,000	3,540,000
Construction:		
90-A-601 Modifications for energy mgmt	17,000,000	17,000,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management	20,540,000	20,540,000
III. Strategic facilities utilization program		
Operating expenses	---	3,000,000
Construction:		
GP-A-101 Excess facilities - GPP	3,000,000	---
Subtotal, Strategic facilities utilization program	3,000,000	3,000,000
TOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS	38,540,000	38,540,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)		
I. Corrective activities		
A. Nuclear energy		
Operating expenses	---	809,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant project	---	442,000
91-E-203 SCTI waste water disposal system	---	2,861,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	3,303,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	---	4,112,000
B. Energy research		
Operating expenses	---	2,756,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant proj, various locations	---	5,080,000
91-E-307 800 Area landfill leachate (ANL)	---	250,000
91-E-304 Sanit. wastewater treatment upgrade	---	400,000
90-R-115 Laboratory and sanitary sewer collection system rehab (ANL)	---	1,000,000
90-R-116 Hazardous waste mgmt proj (BNL)	---	2,240,000
90-R-119 Sanitary wastewater treatment plant improvements (ANL)	---	3,310,000
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade (ORNL)	---	7,913,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	20,193,000
Subtotal, Energy research	---	22,949,000
Subtotal, Corrective activities	---	27,061,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(3,565,000)
(Construction)	---	(23,496,000)

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
II. Environmental restoration		
Operating expenses:		
1. Facilities and sites	---	80,105,000
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects	---	36,200,000
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects	---	124,500,000
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project	---	1,000,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	---	241,805,000
Construction:		
90-R-402 Storage of the ANL CP-5 reactor	---	4,400,000
89-R-113 Environmental upgrades, BNL	---	3,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	7,400,000
Subtotal, Environmental restoration	---	249,205,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(241,805,000)
(Construction)	---	(7,400,000)
III. Waste management		
Operating expenses:		
1. Waste operations	---	110,290,000
2. West valley	---	90,000,000
3. Low level waste	---	11,500,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	---	211,790,000
Capital equipment	---	786,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	3,567,000
91-E-322 Building compliance	---	1,800,000
91-E-305 Waste minimization fac. upgrade, BNL	---	500,000
91-E-306 Haz waste treatment fac, PNL	---	970,000
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL	---	200,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	7,037,000
Subtotal, Waste management	---	219,613,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(211,790,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(786,000)
(Construction)	---	(7,037,000)
IV. Technology development		
Operating expenses	---	500,000
Construction:		
91-EM-100 Environmental and molecular science laboratory at Richland	---	5,200,000
Subtotal, Technology development	---	5,700,000
Program slippage	---	-62,000,000
TOTAL, ENVIRON RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)	---	439,579,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(395,660,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(786,000)
(Construction)	---	(43,133,000)
Education programs	---	-50,000,000
General reduction	---	-14,827,000
Use of prior year balances	-5,900,000	-5,900,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,105,337,000	2,527,082,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,808,706,000)	(2,199,532,000)
(Capital equipment)	(82,467,000)	(83,253,000)
(Construction)	(214,164,000)	(244,297,000)

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT		
I. Corrective activities		
A. Environmental management		
Operating expenses	43,846,000	---
Capital equipment	1,980,000	---
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General Plant Project	3,720,000	---
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance	6,800,000	---
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	22,601,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	33,121,000	---
Subtotal, Environmental management	78,947,000	---
B. Defense programs		
Operating expenses	17,808,000	---
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects	5,259,000	---
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations	4,200,000	---
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	6,000,000	---
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	1,723,000	---
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewaters systems consolidated, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	3,500,000	---
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	44,600,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	65,282,000	---
Subtotal, Defense programs	83,090,000	---
C. Nuclear energy		
Operating expenses	809,000	---
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General Plant Project	442,000	---
91-E-203 SCTI waste water disposal system	2,861,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	3,303,000	---
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	4,112,000	---
D. Energy research		
Operating expenses	2,766,000	---
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects, various locations	5,080,000	---
91-E-307 800 Area landfill leachate (ANL)	260,000	---
91-E-304 San wastewater Trmt Upg	400,000	---
90-R-115 Laboratory and sanitary sewer collection system rehab., ANL	1,000,000	---
90-R-116 Hazardous waste management projects, BNL	2,240,000	---
90-R-119 Sanitary wastewater treatment plant improvements, ANL	3,310,000	---

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade, ORNL	7,913,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	20,193,000	---
Subtotal, Energy research	22,949,000	---
Subtotal, Corrective activities	189,098,000	---
(Operating expenses)	(65,219,000)	---
(Capital equipment)	(1,980,000)	---
(Construction)	(121,899,000)	---
II. Environmental restoration		
Operating expenses:		
1. Facilities and sites	719,820,000	---
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects	36,200,000	---
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects	124,500,000	---
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project	1,000,000	---
Subtotal, Operating expenses	881,520,000	---
Construction:		
90-R-402 Storage of the ANL CP-5 reactor	4,400,000	---
89-R-113 Environmental upgrades, BNL	3,000,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	7,400,000	---
Subtotal, Environmental restoration	888,920,000	---
(Operating expenses)	(881,520,000)	---
(Construction)	(7,400,000)	---
III. Waste management		
Operating expenses:		
1. Waste operations	1,164,217,000	---
2. West valley	90,000,000	---
3. Low level waste	11,500,000	---
Subtotal, Operating expenses	1,265,717,000	---
Capital equipment	82,805,000	---
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects	44,721,000	---
91-D-173 Hazardous low-level waste processing tanks, Savannah River Site, SC	5,800,000	---
91-D-172 High-level waste tank farm upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing plant, INEL, ID	13,000,000	---
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA	2,700,000	---
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	4,100,000	---
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	4,000,000	---
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA	4,300,000	---
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA	9,900,000	---
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	2,640,000	---
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	15,300,000	---
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, ID	26,000,000	---
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment building, ID	11,100,000	---

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	35,660,000	---
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	3,400,000	---
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	11,330,000	---
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	7,600,000	---
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA	75,500,000	---
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	4,985,000	---
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	5,000,000	---
91-D-125 Environment, safety and health upgrades, Phase III, Mound Facility Miamisburg, OH	284,000	---
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	5,500,000	---
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	7,500,000	---
91-E-322 Building compliance	1,800,000	---
91-E-305 Waste minimization fac. upgrade, BNL	500,000	---
91-E-306 Haz waste treatment fac, PNL	970,000	---
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL	200,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	303,790,000	---
Subtotal, Waste management	1,652,312,000	---
(Operating expenses)	(1,265,717,000)	---
(Capital equipment)	(82,805,000)	---
(Construction)	(303,790,000)	---
IV. Technology development		
Operating expenses	183,980,000	---
Capital equipment	16,820,000	---
Construction:		
91-EM-100 Environmental and molecular science laboratory at Richland	5,200,000	---
Subtotal, Technology development	206,000,000	---
V. Program direction	24,106,000	---
Subtctal, Environmental restoration and waste mgmt	2,960,436,000	---
Program slippage due to delays in permitting	-142,000,000	---
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT	2,818,436,000	---
(Operating expenses)	(2,278,542,000)	---
(Capital equipment)	(101,605,000)	---
(Construction)	(438,289,000)	---
URANIUM ENRICHMENT		
I. Uranium enrichment activities		
A. Gaseous diffusion operations and support		
Operating expenses	1,029,200,000	1,029,200,000
Capital equipment	7,800,000	7,800,000
Construction:		
91-U-200 Replace capacitors, GDP, Paducah	4,000,000	4,000,000
91-U-201 Refurbish int. purge fac., GDP, Ports	1,400,000	1,400,000
91-U-207 Roof upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth	3,800,000	3,800,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
91-U-208 S & S upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
90-N-501 Cooling tower mods..................	8,700,000	8,700,000
GP-N-501 GPP.................................	8,800,000	8,800,000
89-N-501 UF6 cylinders.......................	10,100,000	10,100,000
88-N-502 Process inventory control system, Pad	6,300,000	6,300,000
87-N-502 Cooling tower upgrade, GDP, Paducah..	2,000,000	2,000,000
82-N-413 Improved UF6 containment............	4,000,000	4,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.......................	52,500,000	52,500,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and support.	1,089,600,000	1,089,600,000
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation		
Operating expenses............................	146,500,000	146,500,000
Capital equipment.............................	5,600,000	5,600,000
Construction:		
GP-N-600 General plant projects..............	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation....	154,500,000	154,500,000
C. Corrective action - environment		
Operating expenses............................	3,750,000	3,750,000
Construction:		
91-U-206 Reduction of PCB contamination.......	5,500,000	5,500,000
Subtotal, Corrective action - environment..........	9,250,000	9,250,000
D. Environmental restoration		
Operating expenses............................	67,419,000	67,419,000
E. Waste management		
Operating expenses............................	10,304,000	10,304,000
Capital equipment.............................	2,945,000	2,945,000
Construction:		
GP-N-210 General plant projects..............	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, Waste management.........................	13,949,000	13,949,000
F. Program direction - OE.........................	5,300,000	5,300,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities...............	1,340,018,000	1,340,018,000
(Operating expenses)..................................	(1,262,473,000)	(1,262,473,000)
(Capital equipment)..................................	(16,345,000)	(15,345,000)
(Construction).......................................	(61,200,000)	(61,200,000)
Revenues..	-1,450,400,000	-1,450,400,000
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES...................	-110,382,000	-110,382,000
(Operating expenses)..................................	(-187,927,000)	(-187,927,000)
(Capital equipment)..................................	(16,345,000)	(16,345,000)
(Construction).......................................	(61,200,000)	(61,200,000)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH		
I. High energy physics		
A. Physics research		
Operating expenses............................	140,250,000	140,260,000
B. Facility operations		
Operating expenses............................	278,715,000	278,715,000
Capital equipment.............................	83,730,000	83,730,000
Construction:		
91-G-304 AIP.................................	14,535,000	14,535,000
90-R-104 Fermilab Linac Upgrade Project.......	12,000,000	12,000,000
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations....................................	12,317,000	12,317,000
Subtotal, Construction.........................	38,852,000	38,852,000
Subtotal, Facility operations......................	401,297,000	401,297,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
C. High energy technology		
Operating expenses	75,190,000	75,190,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE	4,450,000	4,450,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	621,187,000	621,187,000
(Operating expenses)	(494,155,000)	(494,155,000)
(Capital equipment)	(88,180,000)	(88,180,000)
(Construction)	(38,852,000)	(38,852,000)
II. Nuclear physics		
A. Medium energy physics		
Operating expenses	101,000,000	101,000,000
B. Heavy ion physics		
Operating expenses	72,929,000	72,929,000
C. Low energy physics		
Operating expenses	28,100,000	28,100,000
D. Nuclear theory		
Operating expenses	13,500,000	13,500,000
E. Capital equipment	25,100,000	25,100,000
F. Construction:		
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider	15,000,000	15,000,000
91-G-301 AIP	4,300,000	4,300,000
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	4,200,000	4,200,000
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	65,000,000	65,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	88,500,000	88,500,000
G. Other capital equipment - CE	1,600,000	1,600,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	330,729,000	330,729,000
(Operating expenses)	(215,529,000)	(215,529,000)
(Capital equipment)	(26,700,000)	(26,700,000)
(Construction)	(88,500,000)	(88,500,000)
III. General Science program direction - OE	3,950,000	3,950,000
IV. Superconducting super collider		
Operating expenses	116,000,000	116,000,000
Capital equipment	33,000,000	33,000,000
Construction:		
90-R-106 Superconducting Super Collider	168,866,000	93,866,000
Subtotal, Superconducting super collider	317,866,000	242,866,000
General reduction	---	-50,000,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	1,273,732,000	1,148,732,000
(Operating expenses)	(829,634,000)	(779,634,000)
(Capital equipment)	(147,880,000)	(147,880,000)
(Construction)	(296,218,000)	(221,218,000)
ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND		
A. Isotope Production	16,243,000	16,243,000
B. Receipts from Isotope Sales	-16,243,000	-16,243,000
TOTAL, ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND	---	---

Department of Energy

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
I. Research and development		
A. Research and development - weapons		
Operating expenses	813,664,000	884,318,000
Capital equipment	91,300,000	91,300,000
Construction:		
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	20,000,000	20,000,000
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	19,600,000	9,600,000
88-D-105 Special nuclear materials R & D laboratory replacement, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	20,600,000	---
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	72,547,000	72,547,000
Subtotal, Construction	132,747,000	102,147,000
Subtotal, Research and development - weapons	1,037,711,000	1,077,765,000
B. Nuclear directed energy weapons		
Operating expenses	91,211,000	---
Capital equipment	7,300,000	---
Construction:		
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, (NDER facility at LLNL)	5,000,000	---
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	103,511,000	---
C. Inertial fusion		
Operating expenses	157,900,000	157,900,000
Capital equipment	8,900,000	17,100,000
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	166,800,000	175,000,000
E. Safeguards and security		
Construction:		
88-D-104 Safeguards and security upgrade, Phase II, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	1,000,000	1,000,000
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement II, LLNL, Livermore, CA	---	1,150,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	1,000,000	2,150,000
Subtotal, Research and development	1,309,022,000	1,254,915,000
II. Testing		
A. Weapons program		
Operating expenses	442,268,000	437,268,000
Capital equipment	33,550,000	33,550,000
Construction:		
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,100,000	7,100,000
Subtotal, Weapons program	482,918,000	477,918,000
B. Nuclear directed energy weapons		
Operating expenses	84,443,000	---
Capital equipment	3,950,000	---
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	88,393,000	---
C. Safeguards and security		

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
Construction:		
85-D-105 Combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, NV	4,242,000	4,242,000
Subtotal, Testing	575,553,000	482,160,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,884,575,000	1,737,075,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,589,486,000)	(1,479,486,000)
(Capital equipment)	(145,000,000)	(141,950,000)
(Construction)	(150,089,000)	(115,639,000)
IV. Production and surveillance		
Operating expenses	2,299,880,000	2,161,180,000
Capital equipment	128,571,000	128,571,000
Construction:		
Decision costs:		
91-D-122 Short range attack missile tactical (SRAM-T) production facilities	15,000,000	15,000,000
90-D-122 Production capabilities from the nuclear depth/strike bomb (ND/SB), various locations	13,700,000	---
90-D-123 Follow on to lance warhead production facilities, various locations	3,500,000	---
87-D-122 Short-range attack missile II (SRAM II) warhead production facilities, various locations	8,634,000	8,634,000
Subtotal, Decision costs	40,834,000	23,634,000
Production base:		
Facilities capability assurance program:		
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	131,806,000	106,806,000
Production support facilities:		
GP-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	36,350,000	36,350,000
91-D-123 Production assurance transformer replacement, Kansas City Plant	2,600,000	2,600,000
89-D-125 Plutonium recovery modification project (Bldg. 371), Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	65,000,000	---
88-D-125 High explosive machining facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	8,840,000	8,840,000
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, SC	2,360,000	2,360,000
Subtotal, Production support facilities	115,150,000	50,150,000
Subtotal, Production base - construction	246,956,000	156,956,000
Environment, safety and health:		
91-D-126 Health physics calibration facility (HPCF), Mound, Miamisburg, OH	1,000,000	1,000,000
91-D-127 Criticality alarm and production annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	6,600,000	6,600,000
91-D-125 Environment, safety and health, Phase III, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	1,746,000	---
90-D-126 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations	8,500,000	8,500,000
89-D-126 Environment, safety and health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	488,000	488,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
88-D-124 Fire protection upgrading, various locations	1,481,000	1,481,000
88-D-126 Personnel radiological monitoring laboratories, various locations	1,600,000	1,600,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	21,415,000	19,669,000
Safeguards and security:		
91-D-124 Safeguards and security upgrades, phase III, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	1,100,000	1,100,000
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	18,244,000	18,244,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	19,344,000	19,344,000
Subtotal, Construction	328,549,000	219,603,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,757,000,000	2,509,354,000
V. Program direction		
Operating expenses		
1. Weapons program	95,514,000	95,514,000
2. Community assistance	9,201,000	9,201,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	104,715,000	104,715,000
Capital equipment	1,710,000	1,710,000
Subtotal, Program direction	106,425,000	106,425,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,748,000,000	4,352,854,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,994,081,000)	(3,745,381,000)
(Capital equipment)	(275,281,000)	(272,231,000)
(Construction)	(478,638,000)	(335,242,000)
MATERIALS PRODUCTION		
I. Reactor operations		
Operating expenses	811,457,000	811,457,000
Construction:		
Environment, safety and health:		
91-D-148 Reactor charge/discharge training simulator, Savannah River Site, SC	2,000,000	---
90-D-150 Reactor safety assurance, Savannah River, SC	32,600,000	32,600,000
89-D-148 Improved reactor confinement system, Savannah River, SC	12,800,000	12,800,000
85-D-145 Fuel prod. fac., Savannah River, SC	8,481,000	8,481,000
Subtotal, Construction	55,881,000	53,881,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations	867,338,000	865,338,000
II. Processing of nuclear materials		
Operating expenses	628,969,000	628,969,000
Construction:		
Environment, safety and health:		
90-D-141 Idaho chemical processing plant fire protection, Idaho Falls, ID	6,000,000	6,000,000
90-D-143 Plutonium finishing plant fire safety and loss limitation, Richland, WA	2,500,000	2,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	8,500,000	8,500,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	637,469,000	637,469,000

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
III. Supporting services		
Operating expenses	302,043,000	292,043,000
Construction:		
Programmatic projects:		
91-D-143 Increase 751-A elec substation capacity, Savannah River Site, SC	6,000,000	6,000,000
GP-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	36,994,000	36,994,000
90-D-151 Engineering Ctr, Savannah River, SC	4,000,000	4,000,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phases I thru VI, various locations	61,750,000	61,750,000
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuel Processing Facility, INEL, ID	87,500,000	87,500,000
Subtotal, Programmatic projects	196,244,000	196,244,000
Environment, safety and health:		
91-D-145 New whole body counter facility, Savannah River Site, SC	4,350,000	4,350,000
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, Phases I and II, Savannah River, SC	49,100,000	49,100,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	14,133,000	14,133,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	67,583,000	67,583,000
Safeguards and security:		
89-D-140 Additional separations safeguards, Savannah River, SC	16,300,000	16,300,000
88-D-153 Additional reactor safeguards, Savannah River, SC	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	17,300,000	17,300,000
Subtotal, Construction	281,127,000	281,127,000
Subtotal, Supporting services	583,170,000	573,170,000
IV. Enriched material	117,801,000	117,801,000
V. Capital equipment	105,622,000	105,622,000
VI. Program direction	42,500,000	42,500,000
TOTAL, MATERIALS PRODUCTION	2,353,900,000	2,341,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,902,770,000)	(1,892,770,000)
(Capital equipment)	(105,622,000)	(105,622,000)
(Construction)	(345,508,000)	(343,508,000)
WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT		
I. Transportation management		
Operating expenses	14,660,000	14,660,000
Capital equipment	531,000	531,000
Subtotal, Transportation management	15,191,000	15,191,000
II. Program direction/landlord		
Operating expenses	21,386,000	21,386,000
Capital equipment	18,567,000	18,567,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects	13,556,000	13,556,000
91-D-170 INEL transportation complex, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	870,000	---
91-D-175 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase I Richland, WA	900,000	900,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	8,230,000	8,230,000
89-D-171 INEL road renovation, ID	7,300,000	7,300,000
Subtotal, Construction	30,856,000	29,986,000
TOTAL, WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT	86,000,000	85,130,000
(Operating expenses)	(36,046,000)	(36,046,000)
(Capital equipment)	(19,098,000)	(19,098,000)
(Construction)	(30,856,000)	(29,986,000)
NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS		
I. New production reactors		
Operating expenses	134,900,000	134,900,000
Capital equipment	8,800,000	8,800,000
Construction:		
89-D-154 New production reactor capacity, various locations (design only)	231,300,000	231,300,000
TOTAL, NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS	375,000,000	375,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(134,900,000)	(134,900,000)
(Capital equipment)	(8,800,000)	(8,800,000)
(Construction)	(231,300,000)	(231,300,000)
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT		
I. Naval reactors development		
A. Plant development		
Operating expenses	89,300,000	89,300,000
B. Reactor development		
Operating expenses	258,900,000	258,900,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation		
Operating expenses	207,000,000	207,000,000
D. Capital equipment	55,400,000	55,400,000
E. Construction		
GP-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	8,600,000	8,600,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	4,000,000	4,000,000
90-N-103 Advanced test reactor off-gas treatment system, INEL, ID	1,800,000	1,800,000
90-N-104 Facility renovations, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory (KAPL), Niskayuna, NY	7,900,000	7,900,000
89-N-102 Heat transfer test facility, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY	3,600,000	3,600,000
88-N-102 Expended core facility receiving station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	27,400,000	27,400,000
F. Program direction	14,000,000	14,000,000
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT	652,000,000	652,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(569,200,000)	(569,200,000)
(Capital equipment)	(55,400,000)	(55,400,000)
(Construction)	(27,400,000)	(27,400,000)
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)		
I. Corrective activities		
A. Environmental management		
Operating expenses	---	43,846,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
Capital equipment	---	1,980,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General Plant Project	---	3,720,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance	---	6,800,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	22,601,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	33,121,000
Subtotal, Environmental management	---	78,947,000
B. Defense programs		
Operating expenses	---	17,808,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	5,259,000
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations	---	4,200,000
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	6,000,000
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	1,723,000
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	---	28,000,000
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewaters systems consolidated, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	---	3,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	48,682,000
Subtotal, Defense programs	---	66,490,000
Subtotal, Corrective activities	---	145,437,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(61,654,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(1,980,000)
(Construction)	---	(81,803,000)
II. Environmental restoration		
Operating expenses:		
1. Facilities and sites	---	833,215,000
III. Waste management		
Operating expenses:		
1. Waste operations	---	1,252,927,000
Capital equipment	---	82,019,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	41,154,000
91-D-173 Hazardous low-level waste processing tanks, Savannah River Site, SC	---	5,800,000
91-D-172 High-level waste tank farm upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing plant, INEL, ID	---	13,000,000
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA	---	2,700,000
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	---	4,100,000
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	---	4,000,000
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA	---	4,300,000
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA	---	9,900,000
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	---	2,640,000
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	---	15,300,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, ID	---	26,000,000
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment building, ID	---	11,100,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	---	35,660,000
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	---	3,400,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	---	11,330,000
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	---	7,600,000
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	5,500,000
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	---	7,500,000
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA	---	75,500,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	4,985,000
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	---	5,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	296,469,000
Subtotal, Waste management	---	1,631,415,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(1,252,927,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(82,019,000)
(Construction)	---	(296,469,000)
IV. Technology development		
Operating expenses	---	183,480,000
Capital equipment	---	16,820,000
Subtotal, Technology development	---	200,300,000
V. Program direction	---	24,106,000
Subtotal, Environ restor and waste mgmt (defense)	---	2,834,473,000
Program slippage due to delays in permitting	---	-129,751,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)	---	2,704,722,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(2,225,631,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(100,819,000)
(Construction)	---	(378,272,000)
OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS		
I. Verification and control technology		
Operating expenses	151,484,000	181,484,000
Capital equipment	9,924,000	9,924,000
Construction:		
91-D-192 Foreign Technology Assessment Center, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,592,000	---
90-D-186 Center for national security and arms control, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	10,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	12,592,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	174,000,000	196,408,000
(Operating expenses)	(151,484,000)	(181,484,000)
(Capital equipment)	(9,924,000)	(9,924,000)
(Construction)	(12,592,000)	(5,000,000)

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
II. Nuclear safeguards and security		
Operating expenses	83,934,000	83,934,000
Capital equipment	5,066,000	5,066,000
Construction:		
GP-D-186 General plant projects	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Nuclear safeguards and security	91,000,000	91,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(83,934,000)	(83,934,000)
(Capital equipment)	(5,066,000)	(5,066,000)
(Construction)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
III. Security investigations - OE	65,000,000	65,000,000
TOTAL, OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS	330,000,000	352,408,000
(Operating expenses)	(300,418,000)	(330,418,000)
(Capital equipment)	(14,990,000)	(14,990,000)
(Construction)	(14,592,000)	(7,000,000)
Education programs	---	50,000,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	8,544,900,000	10,914,014,000
(Operating expenses)	(6,937,415,000)	(8,984,346,000)
(Capital equipment)	(479,191,000)	(576,960,000)
(Construction)	(1,128,294,000)	(1,352,708,000)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
I. Administrative operations		
A. Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses	3,911,000	3,911,000
B. General management - personnel compensation and benefits	153,227,000	153,227,000
C. General management - other expenses		
1. Travel	5,314,000	5,314,000
2. Services	132,137,000	132,137,000
3. Capital equipment	4,942,000	4,942,000
Subtotal, Other expenses	142,393,000	142,393,000
D. Program support		
1. Policy analysis and system studies	4,300,000	4,300,000
3. Consumer affairs	45,000	45,000
4. Public affairs	42,000	42,000
5. International policy studies	1,359,000	1,359,000
7. Office of minority economic impact	2,832,000	3,500,000
Subtotal, Program support	8,578,000	9,246,000
Subtotal, Administrative operations	308,109,000	308,777,000
II. Cost of work for others	116,131,000	91,718,000
III. Miscellaneous revenues	-183,413,000	-150,000,000
Subtotal, Departmental administration	240,827,000	250,495,000
Use of unobligated balances	-16,400,000	-16,400,000
General reduction	---	-19,000,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	224,427,000	215,095,000
(Operating expenses)	(219,485,000)	(210,153,000)
(Capital equipment)	(4,942,000)	(4,942,000)
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of the Inspector General	28,421,000	28,421,000
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Power marketing		
1. Operating expenses	3,233,000	3,233,000

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1991 Budget Request	Conference
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Power marketing		
1. Operating expenses	2,624,000	2,624,000
2. Purchase power and wheeling	17,661,000	17,661,000
3. Use of prior year balances	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	9,285,000	9,285,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Power marketing		
1. Operating expenses	17,316,000	17,316,000
2. Purchase power and wheeling	7,899,000	7,899,000
3. Construction	10,182,000	10,182,000
4. Use of prior year balances	-15,290,000	-15,290,000
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	20,107,000	20,107,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Power marketing		
1. Construction and rehabilitation	110,520,000	110,520,000
2. System operation and maintenance	115,509,000	115,509,000
3. Purchase power and wheeling	95,298,000	95,298,000
4. Unobligated balances	-27,565,000	-27,565,000
5. Transfer of permanent authority from DOI	(4,702,000)	(4,702,000)
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	293,762,000	293,762,000
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	122,750,000	122,750,000
Offsetting revenues	-122,750,000	-122,750,000
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND		
Nuclear waste disposal fund	292,833,000	242,833,000
GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND		
Program direction	80,000	80,000
ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS:		
Energy supply research and development		
Operating expenses	1,808,706,000	2,199,532,000
Plant and capital equipment	296,631,000	327,550,000
Total, Energy supply research and development	2,105,337,000	2,527,082,000
Environmental restoration and waste management		
Operating expenses	2,278,542,000	---
Plant and capital equipment	539,894,000	---
Total, Environmental restoration and waste management	2,818,436,000	---
Uranium enrichment		
Operating expenses	1,262,473,000	1,262,473,000
Plant and capital equipment	77,545,000	77,545,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment	1,340,018,000	1,340,018,000
Revenues	-1,450,400,000	-1,450,400,000
Total, Uranium enrichment	-110,382,000	-110,382,000
General science and research activities		
Operating expenses	829,634,000	779,634,000
Plant and capital equipment	444,098,000	369,098,000
Total, General science and research activities	1,273,732,000	1,148,732,000
Isotope production and distribution fund	---	---

Department of Energy - Continued

	FY 1981 Budget Request	Conference
Atomic energy defense activities		
Operating expenses	6,937,415,000	8,984,346,000
Plant and capital equipment	1,607,485,000	1,929,668,000
Total, Atomic energy defense activities	8,544,900,000	10,914,014,000
Departmental administration		
Operating expenses	219,485,000	210,153,000
Plant and capital equipment	4,942,000	4,942,000
Total, Departmental administration	224,427,000	215,095,000
Office of the inspector general	28,421,000	28,421,000
Power marketing administrations:		
Alaska power administration		
Operation and maintenance	3,233,000	3,233,000
Southeastern power administration		
Operation and maintenance	9,285,000	9,285,000
Southwestern power administration		
Operation and maintenance	20,107,000	20,107,000
Western area power administration		
Operation and maintenance	293,762,000	293,762,000
Total, Power marketing administrations	326,387,000	326,387,000
Federal energy regulatory commission	---	---
Nuclear waste disposal fund	292,833,000	242,833,000
Geothermal resources development fund	80,000	80,000
TOTAL, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS	15,504,171,000	15,292,262,000

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Appalachian Regional Commission

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates $170,000,000 instead of $180,000,000 as proposed by the Senate or $150,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agree that a total of $21,500,000 is provided for corridor construction in Alabama; a total of $13,000,000 is provided for corridor construction in Mississippi; and a total of $38,000,000 is provided for Corridor G in West Virginia.

The conferees have agreed to provide $800,000 for a community services facility in Millport, Alabama.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $538,000 for the Contribution to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin as proposed by the Senate instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Due to severe budget constraints, the conferees have reduced the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by $10,000,000. The conferees agree with the Senate report concerning delays in the completion of design certification.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates $135,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 70: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

Sec. 510. Without fiscal year limitation and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or made available under this or any other Act now or hereafter shall be used by the executive branch to change the employment levels determined by the Administrators of the Federal Power Marketing Administrations to be necessary to carry out their responsibilities under the Department of Energy Organization Act and related laws, or to change the employment levels of other Department of Energy programs to compensate for employment levels of the Federal Power Marketing Administrations.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

This amendment expands language included by the Senate to apply only to the Bonneville Power Administration and provides that no funds may be used by the executive branch to change the employment levels of any of the Federal Power Marketing Administrations.

Amendment No. 71: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of "30 days after the date of enactment of this Act" cited in subsection (b)(1) insert "May 1, 1991".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

This amendment prohibits the use of funds to enter into any contract for public works in the United States with any contractor of a foreign country listed by the United States Trade Representative as denying market opportunities to the United States.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1991 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1990 amount, the 1991 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1991 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1990	$18,432,374,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1991	20,214,377,000
House bill, fiscal year 1991	20,775,518,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1991	20,782,405,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1991	20,164,632,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1990	+1,732,258,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1991	−49,745,000
House bill, fiscal year 1991	−610,886,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1991	−617,773,000

TOM BEVILL,
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS,
VIC FAZIO,
WES WATKINS,
LINDSAY THOMAS,
JIM CHAPMAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
CARL D. PURSELL,
SILVIO O. CONTE
(except amendment No. 51),
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
JIM SASSER,
DENNIS DECONCINI,
HARRY REID,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
JAMES A. MCCLURE,
JAKE GARN,
THAD COCHRAN,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
ARLEN SPECTER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

○